

DOUBLE NUMBER, PRICE 3s.

The CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and CLASSICAL REVIEW are the Organs of the Classical Association. The QUARTERLY is published in January, April, July, and October; the REVIEW in the other eight months.

The Classical Review

EDITORS: W. H. D. ROUSE, LITT.D., Perse School House, Cambridge.
A. D. GODLEY, HON.D.LITT., 27 Norham Road, Oxford.

Board of Management:

Prof. R. S. CONWAY, LITT.D., F.B.A., *Chairman.*
Prof. J. F. DOBSON, M.A., *Hon. Treasurer.* Prof. A. C. CLARE, LITT.D., F.B.A., *Hon. Secretary.*
Prof. GILBERT MURRAY, L.L.D., D.LITT., F.B.A., F.R.S.L. *With the Chairman, Treasurer, and Secretary, representing the Council of the Classical Association.*
Prof. O. FLAMSTEAD WALTERS, M.A. OYRIL BAILEY, M.A., *Representing the Oxford Philological Society.*
Prof. SIR WILLIAM RIDGEWAY, D.LITT., LITT.D., Bc.D., L.L.D., F.B.A., *Representing the Cambridge Philological Society.*

With the co-operation of Prof. WM. GARDNER HALE, University of Chicago; Principal Sir W. PETERSON, L.L.D., C.M.G., McGill University, Montreal; Prof. T. G. TUCKER, LITT.D., University of Melbourne.

Vol. XXXIV AUGUST-SEPTEMBER, 1919 Nos. 5, 6

CONTENTS

ORIGINAL CONTRIBUTIONS:	PAGE	REVIEWS:	PAGE
The Homeric Hymns. XII. T. L. AGAR	85	The Price of Freedom. G. W. BUTTERWORTH	110
Some Notes on the Religious Character of Apollo. S. EITREM	88	Natural Science and the Classical System in Education. FRANK GRANGER	110
On the New Fragments of Greek Poetry Recently Published at Berlin. J. U. POWELL	90	Die Pythais: Studien zur Geschichte der Verbindungen zwischen Athen und Delphi. G. C. RICHARDS	113
In Propertium Retractationes Selectae. J. S. PHILLIMORE	91	Greek Political Theory: Plato and his Predecessors. A. E. ZIMMERN	114
A Metrical Peculiarity of the Culex. W. WARDE FOWLER	95	Dreams in Greek Poetry. J. T. S.	116
The 'Prospective.' FRANK H. FOWLER	97	A Gold Treasure of the Late Roman Period. F. H. M.	117
NOTES:		Xenophon, Hellenica I. V. E. C. MARCHANT	118
Epimenides and 'Maxanidus.' E. W. BROOKS	100	Two Tragedies of Seneca. J. WIGHT DUFF	119
The Acts, XV. 29. H. H. JOHNSON	100	Cicero's Letters to Atticus. J. JACKSON	120
Horace C. L. 14. C. A. VINCE	101	SHORT NOTICES:	
Serm. II. 1, 886. Epp. II. 3, 120-3. JEFFERSON ELMORE	101	The Old Testament MSS. in the Freer Collection	121
Cicero's Letters to Atticus, XV. 9. H. W. M. BIRD	103	The New Testament MSS. in the Freer Collection	122
Virgil, Aen. VII. 7. 641 ff. A. M. COOK	103	Translation of Christian Literature	122
Virgil, Aen. VIII. 23. TENNEY FRANK	104	The Value of the Classics. FRANK GRANGER	122
Two Passages of Virgil. H. W. GARROD	105	The Letter of Aristaeas	123
Catullus 39, 11 Pavonis Umber. W. M. LINDSAY	105	NOTES AND NEWS:	
The Derivation of Latin 'Rudis' quasi Singletick. EDWIN W. FAY	106	Greek Music	123
Livy II. 30. 4. M. KEAN	107	BOOKS RECEIVED	124
Livy XXI. 48. 3. M. CARV	107		
Quintilian I. 9. 2. J. P. POSTGATE	108		
Pompey's Compromise. M. CARV	109		
Nostrum Nobis. EDWIN W. FAY	109		

LONDON: JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET, W.
BOSTON, MASS.: GINN & COMPANY, 15, ASHBURTON PLACE.

Price for Single Numbers, 1s. 6d. net; U.S.A., 30 cents net.

THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION

THE objects of the Classical Association are to promote the development and maintain the well-being of classical studies, and in particular (a) to impress upon public opinion the claim of such studies to an eminent place in the national scheme of education; (b) to improve the practice of classical teaching; (c) to encourage investigation and call attention to new discoveries; (d) to create opportunities for intercourse among lovers of classical learning.

Membership of the Association is open to men and women alike. The annual subscription is 5s. (life composition, £3 15s.), and there is an entrance fee of 5s. (not charged to Libraries). Members receive a copy of the annual *Proceedings* of the Association and of *The Year's Work in Classical Studies* (both post free). They may also obtain the *Classical Review* and *Classical Quarterly* at reduced prices, provided that the subscriptions be paid before January 31st in each year. Subscriptions sent in later than that date must be at the rates offered to the general public.

Inquiries and applications for membership should be addressed to the Hon. Treasurer, Mr. E. Norman Gardiner, 2, The College, Epsom, or to either of the Hon. Secretaries, Professor Slater, 4, Chalcot Gardens, London, N.W. 3, and Professor Ure, University College, Reading; or to the Hon. Secretary of any of the district Branches—viz., Miss M. A. B. Herford, The University, Manchester; Miss M. W. U. Robertson, The University, Edmund Street, Birmingham; Mr. Kenneth Forbes, The University, Liverpool; Mr. E. P. Barker, 426, Woodborough Road, Nottingham; Miss Wilkinson, Badminton House, Clifton, Bristol; Mr. Basil Anderton, The Public Library, New Bridge Street, Newcastle-upon-Tyne; Miss E. Strudwick, City of London School for Girls, Carmelite Street, E.C. 4; Miss M. E. Pearson, University Registry, Cathays Park, Cardiff; Mr. P. W. Dodd, The University, Leeds; and, Professor Dawson, Northcote House, Apollo Bander, Bombay.

BOOKS FOR ALL EXAMINATIONS

NEW AND SECOND-HAND
CLASSICS A SPECIALITY

J. POOLE & CO.

104, CHARING CROSS ROAD
LONDON, W.C. 2.

REVISED EDITION A CONCISE DICTIONARY OF GREEK AND ROMAN ANTIQUITIES

Based on Sir Wm. Smith's larger Dictionary, and incorporating the Results of Modern Research. Edited by F. WARR CORNISH, M.A., Vice-Provost of Eton College. With over 1,100 Illustrations taken from the best examples of Ancient Art. 25s. net.

This Dictionary forms a companion volume to the *Classical Dictionary*. In the revised edition the results of recent discoveries, as well as the researches of English and foreign scholars, have been incorporated.

JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE ST., LONDON, W. 1.

MURRAY'S CLASSICAL ATLAS FOR SCHOOLS

Edited by G. B. GRUNDY, M.A., D.Litt.

FELLOW AND TUTOR OF CORPUS CHRISTI COLLEGE, OXFORD

Consisting of 14 Sheets (containing 38 Maps and Plans) with a complete Index.
Folio (14½ x 9½ ins.). Price 7s. 6d. net.

SCHOOL WORLD.—“We have from time to time noticed the issue of some excellent contour maps of the ancient world by Mr. Murray; and we welcome this school atlas based on the same principle. . . . The maps are clearly printed, and the book has a good index. . . . We are specially grateful for maps showing the Roman empire at various dates, ancient Rome at various dates, and the Proponitis. . . . It is a cheap and good book.”

JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET, LONDON, W. 1.

and
pon
nal
to
ate

ual
5s.
ngs
ee).
ced
ach
l to

on.
of
3,
y of
ity,
eet,
P.
ton
dge
for
try,
Pro-

F

nd
ch.
ce-
us-
ent

the
the
nes
or-
i.

OR

ntour
same
e are
ne at

The Classical Review

AUGUST—SEPTEMBER, 1919

ORIGINAL CONTRIBUTIONS

THE HOMERIC HYMNS.

XII.

Εἰς Ἀπόλλωνα.

286 νῆδ' ἀκούσασθαι ἐπήρατον εἶπέ τε μῦθον.

The suggestion of ἤρχέ τε μῦθον would remedy the metrical defect of this line, but there is room for an alternative course by which εἶπέ τε μῦθον might be maintained and the preceding ἐπήρατον found guilty of trespass.

There is no need for any severe treatment of the supposed offender. It is only the unmetrical termination that would suffer if we were to read

ἐπήρα εἶπέ τε.

Ἐπήρης may be fairly inferred from εὐήρης reinforced by κατήρης, with which it would be fairly synonymous, ποδήρης and δυσήρης, which last indeed might be the true reading in l. 64.

It is no derogation to the temple that it should be described as 'fitting,' the word being put in the mouth of Apollo. The vaguely inadequate epithet 'lovely' (ἐπήρατος) suits neither the character of the locality as represented in the *Hymn*, nor of the god himself. In 521 Nitzsch's 'lofty,' 'elevated,' seems preferable, and the possibility of two separate words being confused together cannot be left out of account.

In 295 ἐπ' αὐτοῖς represents an earlier ἐπὶ σφί, and there can be little doubt that the true reading of 297 is:

νῆε Ἐργίνου, φίλῳ ἀθανάτοισι θεοῖσι.

* * *

299 κτιστοῖσιν λάεσσιν, αἰδῶμεν ἔμμεναι αἰεὶ.

As the temple itself would be κτιστός and not the stones, the material of which it was built, most editors adopt

NO. CCLXXIV. VOL. XXXIII.

Ernesti's *ξεστοῖσιν*, and Mr. Allen has suggested but not adopted *τυκτοῖσιν* as well as *ρυτοῖσιν*. He has certainly inserted in his text many worse conjectures, notably and most recently Marx's miserable *ἀμφ' ἡμέων* in l. 171. Here, in view of the frequent confusion of η and ι (v. remarks on l. 13), we should perhaps read, as closer to the tradition, *κμητοῖσιν*, cf. *πολύκμητος*. The simple adjective is not found, as is expressly stated in the *Etym. Magn.*; but though this fact accounts in some measure for the corruption here, only the most arid pedantry could object to *κμητός* on that account. The stones are 'worked,' as we say 'dressed,' with hammer and chisel.

* * *

316 αὐτὰρ δ' ἔγ' ἠπεδανὸς γέγονεν μετὰ πᾶσι θεοῖσι
παῖς ἑμὸς Ἥφαιστος, ῥυκνὸς πόδας, ὃν τέκον αὐτὴ
ῥίψ' ἀνὰ χερσὶν ἐλοῦσα καὶ ἐμβαλον εὖρεῖ πόντῳ.

For γέγονεν 'is' we should certainly read *γεγόνει* 'was born.' The malformation was clearly the cause and not the effect of the fall. Here was determined not to rear a cripple and she takes no blame for her conduct. On the contrary, she still (321) blames Thetis for her rescue-work.

It follows that the pathos of ὃν τέκον αὐτὴ is quite misplaced, and the dogmatic judgment of Allen and Sikes who say the words 'are not to be touched' is again mistaken. Ruhnken was right in the main. The words are a very simple and easy corruption of ὃν τε καὶ αὐτὴ, which is naturally and smoothly followed by ῥίψ' ἀνὰ χερσὶν ἐλοῦσα. Of course, after the appearance of τέκον the smooth sequence is broken,

G

and Demetrius Chalcondyles in 1488 showed his perception of the difficulty by a remark on the margin 'λείπει.' Fortunately he did not immediately proceed to fill up the supposed lacuna by concocting a line of his own, as Mr. Allen has done to the misleading of one editor already.

The ruthlessness of Here expressed by the words *καὶ αὐτῇ* should not be missed. Some revolt against its open avowal probably enough caused the appearance of the affectionate and loving but most inept *τέκον*.

* * *

324 οὐκ ἂν ἐγὼ τεκόμην ; καὶ σὴ κεκλημένη ἔμπης
ἦά ῥ' ἐν ἀθανάτοισιν, οἱ οὐρανὸν εὐρὺν ἔχουσι,

We have here a deplorable instance of ill-advised retrogression. Messrs. Allen and Sikes say in their note, 'editors after Demetrius have read *ἦν ἄρ'* as third person; "even if I had borne her, she would have been called thy daughter."' They are obliged to admit that the sense is excellent. Yet they will have none of it, but adopt a doubtful emendation of Matthiae's, involving a forced emphasis on *κεκλημένη*, a misapplication of *ἔμπης*, and the necessity of understanding *ἄλοχος* or *ἄκοιτις*, for which there cannot be found any justification. Σή alone makes Here, the dignified *matrona Iuno*, talk like a young married lady in the honeymoon, 'Only, only call me Thine.' They explain thus, 'I had at least the title of your wife (although I have been neglected).' It might fairly be asked when she lost that title, for otherwise *εἰμι* would be better than *ἦα* in every respect. Lastly this view completely disables *καί*, which cannot well join a question to an affirmation.

To avoid doing any injustice to Messrs. Allen and Sikes it is only fair to say that they make two objections which they call serious to *ἦν* the third person: (1) *κεν* or *ἂν* would be required, (2) the MSS. are unanimous in reading *ἦ* with variations of accent.

The second objection cannot avail much, seeing that they themselves do not adopt *ἦ* and moreover admit that *ἦν ἄρ* is found in Γ m. 2, while their *ἦ' ἄρ* in answer to Hermann simply gives the case away.

Perhaps the best answer to the first objection, which entirely depends on an erroneous punctuation that conceals the proper correlation of the sentences, would be to present them in a more readable form. The alteration of the tradition is but slight:

οὐ κεν ἐγὼ τεκόμην, καὶ σὴ κεκλημένη ἔμπης
ἦεν ἐν ἀθανάτοισιν, οἱ οὐρανὸν εὐρὺν ἔχουσι ;

'Might not I have borne her, and would she not have been called among the immortals who occupy the wide heaven thy daughter all the same?'

Οὐ κεν or οὐκ ἂν, if a traditional error is to be preserved, belongs equally to *τεκόμην* and to *ἦεν*: καί hitherto useless is rehabilitated: *ἦεν ἐν* accounts by a lipography of *ἐν* for the traditional *ἦ*, not *ἦα*, and we are quit of the stopgap *ῥα* or *ἄρα*, which can hardly be right after no fewer than five words in its clause.

I am inclined to suspect that *παῖς ἐμοί* rather than *παῖς ἐμός* is the true reading in 327, *ἐμός* comes from 317; but this is a small matter compared with the difficulty presented by 329 f.:

οὐδέ τοι εἰς εὐνὴν πωλήσομαι, ἀλλ' ἀπὸ σείο
τηλόθ' εἴσα θεοῖσι μετέσσομαι ἀθανάτοισιν.

I note in passing that the *τηλόθεν οὔσα* of the MSS. has been rightly abandoned, not by Mr. Allen (v. Vol. V. *Homeri Opera*, 1912), but more recently by Mr. Evelyn-White in the Loeb Classical Library edition. This however is only a question of form that any intelligent schoolboy might be trusted to decide.

The real difficulty is that the goddess is made to declare:

θεοῖσι μετέσσομαι ἀθανάτοισιν

'I will consort with the immortal gods,' when it is clear she has no such intention, and in fact does the very opposite (331):

ὡς εἰποῖσ' ἀπονόσφι θεῶν κίε χωμένη κῆρ,

and that there may be no shadow of doubt as to her whereabouts the hymn-writer specifically adds (343):

ἐκ τούτου δὴ ἔπειτα τελεσφόρον εἰς ἐνιαυτὸν
οὔτε ποτ' εἰς εὐνὴν Διὸς ἦλυθε μητιέντος
οὔτε ποτ' ἐς θῶκον πολυδαίδαλον, ὥς τὸ παρὸς περ
α' τῷ ἐφεζομένην πυκινὰς οὐραϊέσκειτο βουλὰς·
ἀλλ' ἦ γ' ἐν νηοῖσι πολυλλίστασι μένουσα
τέρπετο οἷς ἱεροῖσι βοῶπις πότνια Ἥρη.

In spite of this explicit declaration Messrs. Allen and Sikes insinuate vaguely that there is no contradiction in 330, or if there is one, they say it may be attributed to the author's carelessness. Never was criticism more ill-founded. The carelessness belongs to the two critics not to the author. What has happened is plain enough. The tradition is at fault here, as often, owing to well-intended but stupid interference on the part of some rhapsodist or pietist. I take it as certain that the author wrote, what his own words prove him to have written, *μετέσσομαι ἀνθρώποισιν*. The goddess does exactly the same as Demeter under different conditions had done in the preceding *Hymn* (v. 92-3, 319, 331-2, 354-4, 384-5). She retires to her temple, her *boudoir*, among men. But why then do we find *θεοῖσι* . . . *ἀθανάτοις*. Simply because the respectful and reverent rhapsodist could not allow the dignity of Here to be lowered by mixing with the baser sort. She must mix with her peers, the *Dei maiorum genitium*, not with mere human beings. Certainly not. It would be an *ἀπρεπές*. Consequently *ἀνθρώποις* must give way to *ἀθανάτοις*, which is further secured by reading *θεοῖσι* for, it may be, an original *βροτοῖσι*, but it would probably be more pleasurable to the palaeographic mind to think that he merely changed

ἀλλ' ἀπο σείω . . . θεῶν τε.

Compare with this passage *Hes.* Op. 202, where as I have elsewhere suggested *λαῶ* . . . *φρονέοντι καὶ αὐτῷ* has, for the sake of respectability and social exclusiveness, been turned into an impossible and irrelevant

βασιλεῦσι . . . *φρονέουσι καὶ αὐτοῖς*.

In the quoted lines 343-9 for *ὡς τὸ πάρος περ αὐτῷ ἐφεζομένη* I would read,

ὥς τε πάρος περ αὐτῇ ἐφεζομένη (αὐτῇ, 'in state').

The traditional *αὐτῷ* is an evident modernisation which should not be maintained, and another modernisation presents itself in

335 *Τιτῆνές τε θεοί, τοὶ ὑπὸ χθονὶ ναιετάοντες*
Τάρταρον ἀμφὶ μέγαν, τῶν ἑξ ἀνδρῶν τε θεοί τε,

where Allen and Sikes with strangely

mistaken dogmatism pronounce Ilgen's *ναιετάουσι* 'quite impossible.' They are too rash. I agree that 'τοί' is of course a relative pronoun. They can see this; but they cannot see that everyone after the early epic period, for many centuries, readers and transcribers and hearers alike, would naturally be glad to take it as the article, and for this purpose to change any *ναιετάουσι* into the more familiar and usual participle, so producing the recognised elementary *ὁ πρᾶττων* construction known now to every schoolboy, but necessarily quite alien to the old epic speech.

In 337 *αὐτόθι νῦν* is undoubtedly the true reading. It is clearly the classical and earliest example of Mr. Asquith's 'here and now.'

* * *

361 *πικρὰ μάλ' ἔνθα καὶ ἔνθα ἐλίσσεται, λείπε δὲ θυμὸν*
φθινὸν ἀποπνέουσ', ὁ δ' ἐπέεζατο Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων.

Gemoll says the words *λείπε* . . . *ἀποπνέουσ'* are extremely difficult. Allen and Sikes declare with foolish dogmatism that suspicion of the text is quite unwarranted. The key to the difficulty is to be found in the observation that in the early epic the *θυμός* (and the *ψυχή* may be included) *in articulo mortis* invariably quits the creature or man, never the man the *θυμός*. Ruhnken realised this and Matthiae at first, though the actual conjectures they based on it were most unsatisfactory, *λείβε δὲ φθινόν, θυμὸν ἀποπνέουσ'* (Ruhnken) and *λείπε δὲ θυμὸς Φοῖβου ἀπὸ νευρῆς* (Matthiae).

Now to suppose that *λείπε δὲ θυμὸν* can be justified in spite of Homer by Pind. *Pyth.* III. 180 and by Virg. *Aen.* IX. 349 is idle, and a mere misuse of authorities, useful often enough in Homeric criticism, but on such a point totally useless, against Δ 470, M 386, Π 410, 743, T 406, γ 455, λ 221, μ 414, which I must beg my reader to accept as quoted.

It remains to be seen whether any more simple and convincing restoration than Ruhnken's and Matthiae's can be made.

My contribution is certainly more

simple and direct; whether more convincing I leave others to decide:

πικρὰ μάλ' ἔνθα καὶ ἔνθα ἐλίσσεται, κείτο δὲ θυμὸν
φοινὸν ἀποπνείουσ',

'It lay breathing out its life in blood.' The clause is a most telling iteration and enforcement of 358, the final stage of 358:

κείτο μέγ' ἀσθμαίνουσα κυλινδομένη κατὰ χώρον.

The poet has varied *κυλινδομένη κατὰ χώρον* into *ἐνθα καὶ ἐνθα ἐλίσσεται* and also *μεγ' ἀσθμαίνουσα* into the later and intenser stage of *θυμὸν φοινὸν ἀποπνείουσα*, and some foolish rhapsodist probably thought it was left for him to intensify *κείτο* into, as he would suppose, a more fatal and mortal *λείπε*.

* * *

374 αὐτοῦ πῦσε πέλωρ μένος ὀξέος Ἑλλοιο.

There is no point in emphasising the preceding *κεῖθι* by *αὐτοῦ*. Still *δεινὸν* (Schneidewin) and *αἰνὸν* (Bergk) are too remote. *Αὐτως* (v. on *H. Dem.* 371) is probable, involving practically the change of one letter only.

* * *

390 οἱ θεραπεύονται Πυθοὶ ἐνι πετρῆσση.

If the line be genuine (in my opinion it is an interpolation to explain *ὀργίονας* and should be bracketed, not rearranged as by Matthiae and Hermann, together with the equally spurious 393-6, which interrupt the story by anticipating the end). *Πυθοὶ* should for the metre's sake be *Πυθῶν'*, i.e. *Πυθῶνι*, cf. *Hymn Herm.* 178 *εἰς Πυθῶνα*, B 519. The same correction is required in l. 405. *Πυθοὶ ἐν ἡγαθέῃ* (θ 81) is, of course, perfectly metrical.

I will remark further that Gemoll's attempt to defend these lines by a 23-4 is not in point. There we have geo-

graphical information which is not, and could not well be, given elsewhere. This is not the case here.

In 391 *ταῦτ' ἄρα ὀρμαίνων* is impossible. Either *ταῦτ' ἄρ' ὃ γ'* or some other simple avoidance of this needless gap is called for. Contrast 201 where *ὃ* is pure surplusage. Such are the vagaries of the tradition. *Ταῦτ' ἄρ' ἐς ὀρμαίνων ἐνόησε* might be suggested, i.e. *ἵς ἐνόησε*.

Not unfrequently a question arises between tradition and usage. Here is one in which the meaning is much the same either way:

419 ἀλλὰ παρὲς Πελοπόννησον πείραν ἔχουσα
ἦι' ὁδόν, προῖη δὲ ἀναξ ἐκάεργος Ἀπόλλων. . .

For *ἔχουσα*, which certainly cannot be defended, as Allen and Sikes suppose, by the very different usage of γ 182 *αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ γε Πύλουνδ' ἔχον*, I would read *ιοῦσα* (Baumeister's *ἐκούσα* will not scan). An even better instance for my purpose is *ἦι' ὁδόν*, against which I adduce

435 νῆὺς ἀνίσσειε θέουσα θαλάσσης ἄλμυρόν ὕδωρ.

(Note in passing that *θέουσα* is in favour of *ιοῦσα*.) and

γ 496 ἦνον ὁδόν.

which make it highly probable that the true reading here is Barnes's *ἦνεν ὁδόν*.

Gemoll in his commentary roundly and wrongly condemns *ἦνεν* as a 'very bad' conjecture, 'because in γ 496 the journey is at an end, but here it is not.' This is a good specimen of empty dogmatism. Barnes was often enough in the wrong, but not in this instance. Not only is *ἦνεν* a legitimate imperfect here, but *ἦνον* (γ 496) is probably the same ('sought to finish their journey,' M. and R.).

T. L. AGAR.

SOME NOTES ON THE RELIGIOUS CHARACTER OF APOLLO.

1. As commonly known, the personal names of the Greeks offers to us a nearly inexhaustible, at least not yet by far exhausted, source of information as to the Greek religion. Greek families have in innumerable cases in their name-giving given expression to the intimate

relation in which they stood to some definite cult or deity. In these lines I want to call the attention to two personal names found in the edition of the inscriptions from Priene by Hiller von Gärtringen. In nr. 313 he has collected all the *τόπος*-inscriptions in

alphabetical order, and here we read l. 93: ὁ τόπος Ἀπολλᾶδος τοῦ Γαλέου. The editor seems to hesitate whether to take the name as Ἀπολλᾶς ὁ Γαλέου or as Ἀπολλᾶς ὁ Γαλεός (cp. the Index), but surely the former view is the better, if you consider the form of the other τόπος-inscriptions. This Apollas is consequently the son of Γαλέας (cp. e.g. Κυκνέας derived from κύκνος Ditt. Syll.³, 83, 3, Ταυρέας from ταῦρος sim.) or of Γαλεός. As far as I see, F. Bechtel, in his newly-published, extremely useful book, *Die histor. Personennamen des Griech. bis zur Kaiserzeit* (1917), does not mention the name. This name can only be satisfactorily explained if you refer it to the γαλεοί and the importance of these animals for the art of vaticination that the Greeks of historical times attached to Apollo. In Sicily we have (in Hybla) the family named Γαλεοί or Γαλεῶται (cp. F.H.G. I. 190 and 369, Hesych. s.v. etc.), their Heros Eponymos was Galeotes, the son of Apollo and the 'Hyperborean' Themisto, cp. further the Praxitelean Sauroktonos and the Apollo Boason (I cannot agree with the negative results of Kjellberg in his article in the *Realenc.* VII. 592, the very name of Hybla ἡ Γερεᾶτις or Γελεᾶτις referring to the Γαλεοί, or perhaps to the animals themselves, the γαλεοί). The attribute of Apollo and of Dionysos σμίνθος recurs in the personal name Σμίνθος (ἰνθις, ἰθίνας, ἰθων), known from Thespiiai, Megalopolis, Melos, Mytilene (all inscriptions from the sixth to the fourth century B.C.), v. Bechtel, l. l., p. 587. But a Γαλεός (Γαλεῖας) from an Ionic city is a novelty. It gives evidence to the fact that the use of γαλεοί in the 'Apollinic' forms of divination extended to the far East of the Greek world.

2. In the same inscription from Priene, nr. 313, l. 597, we read: ὁ τόπος Ποσειδωνίου τοῦ Πραξίου καὶ Ἀναξιλᾶου Γαλέου or (better, cp. H. v. Gärtr.) Ἀναξιλᾶ [τ]οῦ Γαλέου. In the index of the editor you find very often the name Ἀναξίλαος (Ἀναξίλας), but I especially call attention to Ἀναξίλαος Ἀπολλωνίου and Πάπαρος, a son of Ἀναξίλαος. The relation of this Anaxilaos to the cult of Apollo seems probable, if the name Πάπαρος may be

referred to the same cult of Apollo. Πάπαρος is no singular name in Priene: nr. 313, l. 580; *ib.* l. 581, ὁ τόπος Παπαρίου τοῦ Ἀναξιλᾶου, *ib.* ὁ τόπος Παπαρίωνος (twice), ὁ τόπος Ποσειδωνίου τοῦ Παπαρίου, l. 581 ὁ τ. Παπαρίου τοῦ Παπαρίου, l. 582a ὁ τ. Παπαρίου τοῦ Καλλιμάχου; especially noteworthy in this connexion is l. 90 ὁ τ. Ἀπολλᾶ τοῦ Παπαρ[ου]. Elsewhere the name is, so far as I know, only met with in *Inschr. v. Pergamon*, nr. 569, p. 359, Παπαρίων. Usener, *Kl. Schr.* IV. 183, conjectures that Παπαρίων here might be corrupted from Πασπαρίων, but such an inaccuracy in writing the inscriptions of Priene of course make impossible. But, in fact, the name Πάπαρος may be connected with Πασπάριος, if you only let the etymologising of Usener (deriving it from the Indogermanic root *spar*, cp. *σπαρ*, *σπαλ*) and his light-god out of account. We read in Hesych. s.v. Πασπάριος, ὁ Ἀπόλλων παρὰ Παρίους καὶ Περγαμηνούς. The existence of this god in Pergamon is proved by *Inschr. v. Perg.*, nr. 434, where the Πασπαρεῖται are mentioned. On the other hand, Lobeck (*Pathol.* I. 167) was probably right in comparing the word with Πάρος (or far better with the Ionic colony Parion on the Hellespont). This Πασπάριος again Wernicke, in his article on Apollo in the *Realenc.* II. 63, connected with πασπάλη, and he thought this Apollo Pasparios to be a tutelar god for the cereal crop and the flour (cp. the Apollo Smintheus in even the same Asia Minor). Good reasons seem to favour this view of Wernicke, you only have to assume as a starting-point the identity of the roots *παρ* and *παλ* (*σπαρ* and *σπαλ*, cp. e.g. *στέγος* and *τέγος*); the reduplications [σ]πασπάριος and *παι-πάλη* would be regular (cp. Brugmann-Thumb, *Gr. Gram.*, § 301, 1; to the examples there mentioned you may add *παι-φάσσω* and *Σαι-σάρα*, the daughter of Kelbos in Eleusis, according to the appropriate etymology of Kirchner, *Attica et Peloponnesiaca*, diss. Greifsw., 1890, 52). The mountain Πάρπαρος in Argos Plin. n. h. IV. 17 and Hesych. s.v.) with its holy games might belong to the same root (Usener l. l. 192), but the reduplication *πα-παρ-ος* then re-

mains a difficult one, unless you think of 'dissimilatorischer Schwung' as the late ὑδράγγυρον = ὑδράργυρον, or if you do not recur to the reduplication of the onomatopoeitica βα-βάζα, πα-φλάζω sim.

At any case, in the face of a—probably Apollinic—Πάπαρος in Priene and

Pergamon and of an Apollo Πασπαριος in Parion and Pergamon, we incline to take the two words as referring to the same cognomen of Apollo in Asia Minor, whether this cognomen be originally Greek or not.

S. EITREM.

Kristiania.

ON THE NEW FRAGMENTS OF GREEK POETRY RECENTLY PUBLISHED AT BERLIN.

SOME exceedingly interesting fragments of Greek poetry have been published lately by Wilamowitz-Moellendorf in the *Sitzungsberichte der preussischen Akademie*, 1918, p. 736 ff. Among them occur new fragments of an elegiac poem by Tyrtaeus, shown by the writing to be of the third century B.C., dealing with a war against the Gauls, and therefore a contemporary document bearing upon their invasion of Greece or Asia Minor; some fragments of pseud-Epicharmea, like those published by Grenfell and Hunt from the Hibeh Papyri, and those in the *Berlin. Klass. Texte* V.; a glossary with poetical quotations; and fragments of a Paean and of two other poems supplied with a vocal score, and separated by short pieces of music simply with the instrumental score: the date of this unique musical papyrus is the second century A.D.

I offer a few suggestions upon two of these.

1. The Hamburg Papyrus, the date of which is the middle of the third century B.C., containing seventeen incomplete lines of a Hellenistic elegiac poem, is provokingly mutilated. We have the account of an envoy delivering his report to a king. Danger is threatened by θούρος ἀνὴρ Γαλάτης, whose hardy life is contrasted with that of the Medes: they do not live softly: v. 17, ἀλλὰ χά[μ]εννα Διὸς τε καὶ αἰθριά[ι] ἐν[ι]. We may accept Wilamowitz' restoration of the first part of the line, but not his ἐν[αντόν]: what is required is some form of ἐνιαύνειν: αἰθριάν here appears to be used in the sense of αἰθριοκοιτεῖν. Lines 11 and 12 run:

'We have enslaved braver men before, and these shall pay ταύτης μισθὸν ἀπασθαλῆς (11, 12), [.] ὑβριστὰι τε καὶ ἄφρονες' (v. 9): the gap is plainly to be filled by ἀνέρες.

We have clearly here a contemporary document treating of the invasion of the Gauls into Greece and Asia Minor, of which we get echoes in Callimachus IV. 175 ff. and the Delphic Hymns to Apollo; or of something arising out of it.

We can only guess who the king was, but we know that Attalus I. took the title of king from his victory over the Gauls, and we might provisionally suggest Musaeus of Ephesus as the author of the poem, since Suidas states that he wrote poems in praise of Eumenes and Attalus: ἔγραψε Περσηίδος βιβλία ἰ' καὶ (<ῶνους> Wachsmuth) εἰς Εὐμένη καὶ Ἀτταλον. There is no need to place Musaeus, as Susamihl does, in the time of Attalus II. Wilamowitz however thinks that the pressure of danger points to the king being a Seleucid. Yet a reference to the plot of Ptolemy Philadelphus' Gallic mercenaries (Paus. I. 7, 2) is not excluded.

2. Upon an *ostrakon* in writing of the third century B.C. are explanations of unusual words, with quotations from an unknown writer, from Homer, Antimachus, and Hipponax. I extract the words with which we are here concerned, ll. 4-8:

πρυσασχοῖνια ὁμηρου κετοδυνπαιθουσ[
νέοσαμφιελίσσησ βυβλινον ωιτε πεδησε
θυρας[
λυθεν αυτοσ αντιμαχου ενδιστον θηκεν
λαίφεισι δε

λινεοισι σουσα ετιθει παντοια θεα ποδας
 ηδε καλωας
 ενδυπερασστρεπτας οπλατε παντα νεωσ

That is:

σουσα, σχοινία · Ὁμήρου ·
 κείτο δ' ὑπ' αἰθούσῃ] νεὸς ἀμφιέλις-
 σης
 βύβλινον, ᾧ τε πέδησε θύρας [] λυθεν
 αὐτός.

Ἀντιμάχου ·

ἐν δ' ἴστον θῆκεν, λαίφεσι δὲ λινέοις
 σοῦσ' ἐτίθει παντοῖα θεά, πόδας ἡδὲ
 κάλωας

ἐν δ' ὑπέρας στρεπτάς ὅπλα τε πάντα
 νεώς.

The lines from Homer are *Odyssey* φ 390, 391, where our texts have ὅπλων in the first line, and ἐς δ' ἦεν in the second; the *ostrakon* obviously had ἐς δ' ἤλυθεν. In the first line Wilamowitz would restore the new word σοῦσον, and suggests σοῦσφ' εὔστρεφέι in ξ 346, where our texts have

ἐνθ' ἐμέ μὲν κατέδησαν εὔσσελμφ' ἐνὶ νηὶ
 ὅπλφ' εὔστρεφέι.

The question of altering these two passages I leave to Mr. Allen and Mr. Agar; I am more concerned with this strange word σοῦσον. It will be found in the *Lexicon* with the meaning 'lily,' and is called by Fick a Semitic word. But I am inclined to think that there is a mistake in the *ostrakon*. In the first place it is incredible that any member of the Liliaceae could be used for the purpose of making a rope; they are too brittle in all their parts. But

that a rare word was being explained and illustrated by the person who wrote on the *ostrakon* is certain. I strongly suspect that the word should be οὔσον, and that it appeared in the text of Homer from which the writer quoted, and in his text of Antimachus. Hesychius has the gloss οὔσα · σχοινία, νεὼς ὅπλα; and the word occurs in literature in the fragment of Alexander Aetolus preserved in Parthenius, *Erot.* XIV. 21:

γαῦλός μοι χρύσεος . . .
 νῦν δ' ἄνελκόμενος, διὰ μὲν κάλον
 ἤρικεν οὔσον.

Οὔσον is certain there, although the reading of the rest of the line is not; in the last half I take Lord Harberton's suggestion of κάλον (= κάλων) for MS. κακόν, translating it with him 'the withy handle frayed through the rope.'

In lines 2 and 3 of the *ostrakon* another poetical quotation occurs,

]ιτερα ηιωρουντο.[
 ἐνεσείσατο δὲ σφιν δε[. . .].α.[

the name of the author being lost. Wilamowitz gives περὰ ἡωροῦντο; and it is a curious thing that in a fragment apparently of Antimachus of Colophon, published by Wilamowitz in *Berlin. klass. Texte* III. 27, περὰ appears to be used with a plural verb: περὰ προσπεφύασι is his restoration. There is then a possibility that this quotation on the *ostrakon* is also from Antimachus.

J. U. POWELL.

IN PROPERTIUM RETRACTATIONES SELECTAE.

(SEE *Class. Rev.*, 1916, p. 39; 1917, p. 87.)

I. iii. 8:

talis uisa mihi mollem spirare quietem
 Cynthia non certis nixa caput manibus.

What are *non certae manus*? *Certa manus* is familiar enough in the sense of 'a good shot.' When Ovid speaks of drinking and dicing,

nec iuvat in lucem nimio marcescere uino,
 nec tenet incertae alea blanda manus
 (Ex *Ponto* I. v. 46),

the gambler's hands are *incertae* because he is *marcidus*. I see in the context no

implication that Cynthia's slumbers are drunken; the images (Ariadne, Andromeda, or Maenad) merely describe the deep sleep of utter fatigue. Perhaps the poet wrote

consertis nixa caput manibus.

In the literal sense ('to clasp hands') this phrase is very much less common than in the metaphorical (= *pugnare conserere*), but it is sufficiently attested. As for the plastic type, most of the examples catalogued by Reinach ('Ré-

pertoire, s.v. Ariane, Ménade,' etc.) show the sleeping woman with one hand beneath her head and the other extended by her side (so Philost. *Imag.* I. 14) or drooping. But since in this case Cynthia's head is resting on her hands, does not the plural suggest that they cannot be otherwise than *consertae*?

Ib. 19, 20:

sed sic intentis haerebam fixus ocellis
Argus ut ignotis cornibus Inachidos.

'I hesitated, stuck, with gazing eyes, as Argus . . .' To describe a man staring in amazement Ovid (*Epist.* VI. 26) has:

haesit in opposita lumina fixus humo

Virgil:

Turnus ad haec oculos horrenda in uirgine fixus.

Fixus (which, for some unknown reason, Lewis and Short call 'very rare in the literal sense) is used for 'stuck, rooted, riveted,' of the whole person:

talia perstabat memorans fixusque manebat
(*Aen.* II. 650).

In our passage *intentis ocellis* is adverbial to *haerebam* rather than to *fixus*. Now the simile of Argus is in point only if it is Propertius who is *intentis ocellis*; and the horns (*ignotis cornibus*) no less evidently belong to Io. The question is: could even Propertius, who notoriously makes the ablative a maid-of-all-work, contrast (within a couplet) a pair of ablatives in such widely disparate senses? 'haerebam intentis ocellis ut Argus (haesit) ignotis cornibus.' *Credat Hertzbergius* that any Augustan wrote such unsymmetrical perversity.

We want something to express that it was *when confronted with, at the appearance of* the horns, that Argus was fascinated. In with the ablative expresses this, and the alteration of a single letter gives us:

Argus ut in *gnatis* cornibus Inachidos

for the use of *nascor* cf.

quam cuperem fronti cornua nata tuae (Ov. *Art.* I. 308)

and for the rest,

nec minus inter
ille tot ignoti socias gregis haeret in una
defixus (Val. *Fl.* V. 376).

Apropos of Io's horns let me digress for a moment to

Virg. *Aen.* VII. 789:

at leuem clipeum sublatis cornibus Io
auro insignibat, iam saetis obsita, iam bos.

Sublatis cornibus means 'with uplifted horns,' 'tossing the head': a grotesque beginning for the process of transformation. Of *iam bos* it makes a bathos: *iam* is absurd after *sublatis cornibus*. Virgil is here amusing himself with one of those virtuosities of ecphrasis when it is pretended that plastic art has the successiveness which belongs only to language. In these verbal 'films' not merely an exact moment of time is described, but transition. Ovid's *Metamorphoses* abound in examples.

I hope it will not be thought irreverent or blasphemous if, rather than suppose the poet capable of *sublatis*, I venture to hint that here a copyist has for a moment eluded the particular providence which has safeguarded the text of Virgil from such errors as have crept into the text of, say, Milton or Dickens, and gone wrong by just one stroke. Read not *SUBLATIS* but *SUBNATIS* *CORNIBVS*. 'Io, relieved against the field of polished metal, showed horns just budding—and now she had a coat of hair—and now she was bovine.' That is: the eye is imagined to follow the phases of metamorphosis till it is consummated—*iam bos*.

I. vii. 16:

te quoque si certo puer hic concusserit arcu
quoi nolim nostros euigilasse deo.

So I suggest that these lines be read. The pentameter is admittedly corrupt. The palaeographical cheapness of the conjecture will not be denied: *quoi* for *quod*, *euigilasse* for *euiolasse*, *deo* for *deos*—these are the changes asked; and *ex hypothesi* the corruption *deos* was inevitably consequent on the other corruptions.

By these words is to be understood: 'Let once the boy to whose divine vigils I would be sorry to see my friends devoted, strike you with his unerring marksmanship, and—farewell to your epics!'

From the proposed pentameter *hic puer* gains definition, which it greatly needs: for as Amor has not been named in the poem, the vagueness of the words is strange and offensive. Also the awk-

ward unbalance between protasis and apodosis is righted by bringing the pentameter into the construction, instead of leaving it as an exclamatory interruption.

Euigilare 'to watch through' is in Tibullus I. viii. 24. Propertius offers a near parallel in I. ix. 28:

quippe ubi nec liceat uacuos seducere ocellos
nec uigilare alio numine, cedat Amor?

(Brouckhuysen's punctuation.) MSS. *nomine*, but the correction seems to be imposed by Silius XI. 409:

aut nostro uigiles ducat sub numine noctes

(Venus is speaking.)

Euigilare = *peruigilare* = $\pi\alpha\nu\nu\chi\iota\zeta\epsilon\nu$. The dative *cui* (*quot*) . . . *deo* is like $\pi\alpha\nu\nu\chi\iota\zeta\omicron\nu\sigma\iota\nu\ \theta\epsilon\acute{\alpha}$ in Aristoph. *Ran.* 445.

The perfect infinitive is not, as often in Ovid, to be accounted for *metri gratia*, but by the *nolim*: for the idiom of *nolim* and *uelim* with this tense there are multitudes of examples ranging from archaic texts, like the Consular Letter regarding the S.-C. *de Bacchanalibus* (Ernout, *Recueil*, p. 63); decrees *ap. Aul. Gell.* X. 3, XIII. 13; Cato, *R.R.* V.; Ter. *Hec.* 563; Lucr. III. 68 to Hor. *Sat.* I. ii. 28, II. iii. 187; Ov. *Am.* I. iv. 38; Sil. Ital. XIII. 318.

I. viii. 13-16. I suggest that this vexed quatrain should read:

ergo ego nunc uideam tali sub sidere uela
cum tibi prouectas auferet unda ratis,
et me defixum uacua patietur in ora
crudelem infesta saepe uocare manu?
sed quocumque modo κ.τ.λ.

In 13 I substitute *ergo* for *atque* (*aut* ξ) on the supposition that *ergo* has fallen out by haplography and the gap has been stopped with *atque*. Heinsius similarly supplies a missing *ego* in II. viii. 13:

ergo ego iam multos nimium temerarius annos

(For this *ergo* of desperate resignation *cf.* III. xxi. 17.

ergo ego nunc rudis Hadriaci uehar aequoris
hospes?)

nunc for the *non* of the MSS. is as old as Bapt. Pius.

For *uentos* I read *uela*. 'So I must needs behold this unseasonable sailing, at the hour when your ship shall have reached the harbour-mouth, and the waters bear it away, bear *you* away,

and leave *me* rooted on the empty beach, shaking my fist and crying "Cruel!"'

Videre uela is Propertian:

at tu, saeue Aquilo, nunquam mea uela uidebis
(III. vii. 71),

and Ovidian:

ut te non poteram, poteram tua uela uidere
(*Epist.* XIII. 19)

ut qui Theseae fallacia uela carinae
uidit (Ibis 492).

To take *sub sidere* as preposition and noun was Heinsius' view, anticipated by the correctors' hands in F and V (*sub sydere*). Of the five examples that I find in Latin poetry, three give a geographical determination:

sub sidere Cancrī (Virg. *Ecl.* X. 68)

alio *sub sidere* (Lucan II. 294)

nostro *sub sidere* (Juvenal XII. 13)

and two an astrological:

sub sidere tali (Manilius V. 46 and 231).

I admit that the direct Virgilian prototype of our verse has no *sub*:

quin etiam hiberno moliris sidere classem?
(*Aen.* IV. 309),

but it will hardly be objected that *sub sidere* cannot bear the sense of 'season and weather' which *sidere* bears in Dido's line and in the first verse of the *Georgics*. Dido's line seems to give the key for vv. 9-16 of our poem: it is heartless of C. to go off to Illyria at all; particularly heartless to go regardless of weather, *uento quolibet* (4) and now *tali sub sidere*:

Encor si la saison s'avancait davantage!
Attendez les zéphyrus.

I. ix. 23-4:

nullus Amor cuquam facilis ita praebuit alas
ut non alterna presserit ille manu.

Certainly Ovid's *leuitas sua praebuit alas* (*Met.* XIII. 606) means 'lightness lent wings'; but it does not follow that Love lends a man wings here. Dr. Postgate's and Mr. Butler's explanations seem to depend on this. Rothstein's general view of the passage seems to me more probable: 'never did Love offer his wings readily to any man (to catch him by) without his presently turning on him and crushing him:' although his note goes off into a mist of delusions and confusions. This view of *praebuit alas* is vindicated by such parallels from Propertius as:

flammae pectora praebent (III. xiii. 21)
 cum uix tangendos praebuit illa pedes
 (IV. viii. 72)
 et caput argutae praebat historiae (III. xx. 28)
 ah nimium faciles aurem praebere puellae
 (II. xxi. 15)

which may be abundantly reinforced from the Ovid index with *aurem, aures, brachia, capillos, colla, manum, manus*, etc., *praebere*: all in the sense of yielding or offering passively.

Suppose then an ordinary Cupido *ales* allowing his wings to be stroked like a tame bird: *faciles* means 'unresisting, at your disposal, and answers to the gerundives in *praebuit tangendos pedes, pectendos capillos*, etc. Just as you think you have him quite tame as a pet, the other side of the creature comes out. In what action? Does *alterna manu* simply mean *uicissim*, as editors since Hertzberg have generally held? In that case the whole contrast must be conveyed in *presserit*. But *premere* is an exceedingly vague word, unless the context determine it.

In the couplet which Rothstein adduces (III. xxi. 5)

omnia sunt temptata mihi quacunq̃ fugari
 possit; at ex omni me premit iste deus,

the strategic metaphor in *fugari* gives strategic colour to *premit*. Here there is nothing to determine *presserit*.

It is necessary then to examine the words *alterna manu*.

In Prop. I. xi. 2 '*alternae facilis cedere lymphæ manu*' refers to swimming; Ovid has likewise '*alternaque brachia ducens*,' of a swimmer (imitated by Manil. V. 424); in Statius *Theb.* VI. 860 '*et iam alterna manus frontemque umerosque . . . lacessit*' describes boxing; in *Theb.* IX. 62 '*alternæque manus = rixa*.'

Nonnus affects ἀμοιβαῖος in similar phrases:

Ἀδωνὴν πληγῆσιν ἀμοιβαίῃσιν ἰμάσσῳ (boxing)
 (XLIV. 138)
 ποσσὶν ἀμοιβαλοῖσιν ὀπίσσω ὤθειν ὕδωρ (swimming)
 (VII. 189)
 ποσσὶν ἀμοιβαλοῖσιν ἀνεσκιρτήσιν ἀλωεύς (dancing)
 (XLVII. 64)

Alterna manu can mean *uicissim*, as in Ov. *Fasti* II. 234:

uolneraque alterna dantque feruntque manu,
 though it has been shown above that such is not its most usual meaning.

Why make more ado about it? Because the vagueness of *presserit* is not the only difficulty. *Restat scrupulus*: is not *ille* in the pentameter just to indicate that the subject of the second verb is not *amor* but the other party? Unless *ille* means the mortal, the *cuiquam* of the preceding verse, is not the expression gratuitously misleading?

But if *ille* is the victim, *presserit* is not merely vague but nonsensical—and corrupt.

If we choose the most obviously appropriate amongst the senses of *alterna manu* above detailed, viz. boxing, the man who takes punishment in boxing may be said *sentire alternam manum* (or *alternas manus*):

tuas sentiat illa manus (II. x. 18)

Reading '*ut non alternam senserit ille manum*' the postulated error amounts to '*seferit*' misread as '*psserit*,' which is not enormous in a mediocre tradition such as we are dealing with.

The idea then is this: you think him a cherub, but you find you have caught a bruiser.

Children as boxers are shown in Reinach's *Répertoire de la Statuaire*, Vol. I., p. 541; but I cannot produce a palpable Eros pyktes.

I. xi. 6:

ecquis in extremo restat amore locus?

Mirum profecto loquendi genus, as Lachmann remarked. His uneasy note, which is in great part concerned with refuting Passerat's conjecture *externo*, makes interesting reading. He points out that Propertius uses *extremus* for *minimus*:

Haec sed forma mei pars est extrema furoris
 (I. iv. 11)

and adduces Stat. *Silv.* I. ii. 100 (where most editors read *hesterna*), and Nemesianus *Cyneg.* 231. So far good; but he proceeds to pronounce that the MSS. reading must be retained and rendered *ecqua mihi parua amoris tui pars residua est*? The difficulty has not been faced. Is it Propertius' Latin—in *extremo amore* for *in extrema parte amoris tui*?

I cannot discover that any commentator cites the phrase from Terence which is most nearly germane to our passage:

certe *extrema linea*
amare haud nil est

(*Eun.* 640)

(Donatus *ad loc.* nicely distinguishes the *quinque lineae amoris*.)

which is illustrated by Thraso's appeal:

perfice hoc

precibus pretio ut haeream in parte aliqua
tandem apud Thaidem (*Eun.* 1055).

Here we have the idea of marked grades in love: it seems to have become proverbial, for Lact. Plac. has:

puellam *extrema amoris linea* diligens satis
animo solo faciebat aspectu (*ad. Stat. Theb.* 3.
283).

The ἀρα μένει στοργῆς ἐμὲ λείψανα;
motif of Meleager (*A.P.* V. 165) takes on a spatial metaphor which is not uncommon in Latin (Greek offers such instances as Plato *Legg.* VII. 823 ὁ μὴδ' εἰς τὸν ἔσχατον ἐπέλθοι νοῦν ἄφασθαι). *Locus* and *pars* are exchanged, as e.g. in the following:

quod siquis inter hos *locus* mihi restat
(*Priap.* XXXVI. 10)

pars in amore meo uita tibi remanet
(*Apul. de Mag.* IX.)

and Lucan's

ullusne in cladibus istis
est *locus* Aegypto? (*VIII.* 545.)

What remains unvindicated is in *extremo amore*: nothing is alleged which can persuade me that *extremus amor* can mean anything but a last love. Surely the governing phrase in Terence and all other indications point to this:

ecquid in extremo restat amare loco?

i.e., *extrema linea amare*. This means both the furthest out-of-the-way and the least dignified station.

Thus in early days, when protocol was all at sixes and sevens, before the powers of Precedence and Deference had arranged for proper ceremonies in heaven,

Tethys *extremo* saepe recepta loco est
(*Ov. Fast.* V. 22).

I add an instance from St. Augustine:

si ergo aliquis magnus procurator offendat et poena domini sui (uerbi gratia) fiat ostiarius in aliquo *extremo loco* . . . (*Enarr. in Ps.* CIII., p. 1674, edit. Bened.).

Once *amare* became *amore*, *loco* was bound to become *locus*, and *ecquid* be changed to *ecquis*. Read so, *extremo loco* here answers to *pars extrema* in I. iv. 11.

J. S. PHILLIMORE.

University of Glasgow.

A METRICAL PECULIARITY OF THE CULEX.

THE chief glory of the Latin hexameter, as brought to perfection by Virgil, lies in the constant subtle variation of the last two feet, in close connexion with the fourth. Only now and then, and almost always with special intention, does the poet introduce what may be called a startling, or seemingly awkward, variety of these last two feet, such as 'procumbit humi bos,' or 'simul hoc animo hauri' (*Aen.* XII. 26), and other lines of which the Poet Laureate has recently reminded us. But there is one peculiar line-ending which is almost entirely absent from Virgil's most finished work; I mean that where, with or without a pause or full stop at the end of the fourth foot, the first syllable of the fifth is a monosyllable, and sometimes a weak one: e.g. 'Si nescis, meus ille caper fuit: et mihi Damon' (*Ecl.* III. 23). This monosyllable is usually either an 'et,' or

'nam,' or an interrogative pronoun, which gives the line a certain awkwardness, depriving it of the majesty which we have come to expect in the hexameter. In Lucretius, who as a rule was more anxious about his matter than his metre, this ending is extremely common: there are few pages of his poem in which it is not to be found.

I happened lately to notice that there are a good many lines in the *Culex* with this ending: in fact I found that my ear had always associated it with the *Culex*, chiefly on account of the lines 37-39, which have a special interest for me:

haec tibi, sancte puer, memorabimus, haec tibi
restet
gloria perpetuum lucens mansura per aevum.
et tibi sede pia maneat locus, et tibi sospes. . .

Out of curiosity I went through the poem, counting the lines of this kind, and found about twenty out of 414. Then I went on to the *Ciris*, where, as

I expected, the result was quite different: I could only find three examples (or four including a corrupt line) in all the 541 lines.¹

I then went on to the *Eclogues* and *Georgics*; but before I say anything of the real and undoubted Virgil, I will quote some of the most notable lines in the *Culex* which show the peculiarity I am speaking of:

mente prius docta fastidiat, et probet illi (59).
ima susurrantis repetebant ad vada lymphæ (105).

Attaliciis opibus data vellera, si nitor auri (63).
ereptus taetris ex cladibus; at mea manes (214).
sed tu crudelis, crudelis tu magis Orpheu (292).

When we find this line again in Virgil, it has become 'crudelis tu quoque mater' and is repeated in line 51 (of *Ecl.* VIII.); this is an immense improvement, if my ear does not deceive me. In 349 ff. we have—

omnia turbinibus sunt anxia. iam maris unda
sideribus certat consurgere, iamque superne
corripere et solis et sidera cuncta minatur
ac ruere in terras caeli fragor. hic modo laetans. . .

At the end of the poem we find a number of examples: lines 386, 391, and 398, which ends with 'hic et acanthos,' followed in 402 by 'hic rododaphne,' and in 406 by 'hic amarantus.' About the reading of these passages there is practically no doubt, I believe.

After this examination, I felt fairly well satisfied that the author of the *Culex*, unlike the author of the *Ciris*, must have had his head full of Lucretius: that in spite of the almost Virgilian 'care and finish' in some passages, which Mr. Mackail has emphasised in *Classical Review*, 1908, p. 72, the poet was by no means perfect master of the hexameter: and thirdly, that if, as I myself believe on other grounds, that poet was the very youthful Virgil, the influence of Lucretian versification only bears out the evidence of other Lucretian influence, which has often been noticed, e.g. by Skutsch, *op. cit.* p. 127 note, and 129: and Miss Jackson in *Classical Quarterly*, 1911, p. 167. But I will now go on to give the results of an

examination of Virgil's maturer work in respect of this same metrical feature.

In the *Eclogues*, which together contain about double the number of the lines in the *Culex*, there are just the same number of examples of our line-ending; and none of them are so bald or weak as a few of those in the earlier poem, unless it be the 'Linus' line in IV. 56, 'nec Linus, huic mater quamvis atque huic pater adsit.' In *Ecl.* IX. there are an unusual number, six in all; but if these be examined (lines 17, 33, 51, 53, 59, 60), it will be seen that they all come in smoothly and naturally, without offending the ear. In *Ecl.* X. there is only one, where the word 'nam' is repeated with some effect: 'Nam neque Parnasi vobis iuga, nam neque Pindi Ulla moram fecere,' as the word η is repeated in the original (*Theocr.* I. 66).

Thus the evidence of the *Eclogues* seems to prove that the author was more experienced and skilful than the author of the *Culex*, and less under the influence of Lucretius. This is exactly what we should expect, if the poet of the *Culex* was really the young Virgil. The evidence of the *Georgics* shows again a clear advance. There are more than 2,000 lines in the four *Georgics*, and only about twenty examples of our line-ending (i.e., one per cent.), none of which would be likely to trouble a fastidious reader.² In II. 486 the poet has found out how to make a beautiful effect with this usually most ineffective ending: let me quote the whole lovely passage:

sin has ne possim naturae accedere partes
frigidus obstiterit circum praecordia sanguis,
rura mihi et rigui placeant in vallibus amnes,
flumina amem silvasque inglorius. O ubi campi
Spercheusque. . .

Another beautiful instance is IV. 498, not quite the first example I have met with as yet of its enchanting rhythm:

feror ingenti circumdata nocte
invalidasque tibi tendens, heu non tua, palmas.
(cf. II. 82.)

The almost perfect versification of the *Georgics*, which first in Latin poetry

¹ Skutsch does not refer to this ending, but only to the spondaic one, in his *Virgil's Frühzeit*, I. p. 74. In the highly finished *Moretum* there is no example of this line-ending.

² *Geo.* I. 29, 150, 380; II. 308, 321, 447, 486; III. 8, 35, 176, 260, 416, 496, 499; IV. 84 (a noticeable instance), 418, 498.

showed how the last two feet of the hexameter are the supreme test of a poet's power to express his feeling by his rhythm, has absorbed into its ever varying structure what has so often been an almost ugly ending, and compelled it here and there to put on a peculiar beauty of its own.

It was hardly necessary to carry the enquiry further, but out of curiosity I looked through most of the books of the *Aeneid*. In the first six books there are about 4,700 lines, and only about 22 of them show our ending—*i.e.*, about $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. The only remarkable ones are II. 530, where the use is obvious and effective:

illum ardens infesto vulnere Pyrrhus
insequitur, iam iamque manu tenet et premit
hasta,¹

and IV. 336 'dum memor ipse mei, dum spiritus hos regit artus.' In the sixth book (123) we have 'ab Iove summo' (cp. *Geo.* III. 35), and one or two others in the first half of the book, *e.g.* 277, 'tum consanguineus Leti Sopor et mala mentis Gaudia,' where I do not suppose that anyone will quarrel with the stress on 'et,' so different from similar stressed *et*'s in the *Culex*. In the last half of book VI., unsurpassed in Latin poetry, I have not found a single example.

In the last three books the versification is less smooth and finished than in the first six: this is particularly so in the tenth book, as the late Mr. F. W. H.

Myers noticed.² Now in this book I have counted no less than seventeen examples of our ending: fair evidence that the book was left in need of revision. On the other hand, in the first 200 lines of book XI., which are some of the most beautiful and finished in the whole poem, I can only find one example, and that a very harmless one. So too in the last two hundred lines of book XII. On the whole we may infer that it was the deliberate aim of Virgil in careful revision to eliminate as far as possible all commonplace or meaningless examples of this line-ending, using it only when it could produce an effect either striking or beautiful, as the sense required. But where we have his unfinished work, they are sometimes little more than tibiae, or stop-gaps, which, as Mr. Myers says, 'suggest a grotesque resemblance to the style of the fourth-form boy.'

The *Culex* was never revised, but only made use of in later days for thoughts and pictures which could be clothed in really beautiful language by a more mature artist. We may perhaps see in it, better than in any part of the later poems, the raw material with which the great master of the hexameter began all his work. Such at least is my view of it: and I hope that this little investigation of a small point in its structure may be convincing to others also.

W. WARDE FOWLER.

¹ Cf. XII. 355 ff.

² *Classical Essays*, p. 138.

THE 'PROSPECTIVE.'

SOME recent discussions¹ of 'prospective' subjunctives in Latin, and those of earlier date as well, seem to involve certain misconceptions.

In the first place, these discussions ostensibly deal with a modal meaning; but really the notion conveyed by Mr. Sonnenschein's term 'prospective' is a temporal one, that of futurity; indeed,

in his first article on the 'prospective' he speaks of this subjunctive as a 'future-equivalent.' Of Mr. Hale's term 'anticipatory' the same thing should be said. More frank is the term 'futural' used by Kroll and others. Now these so-called 'prospective' subjunctives are not equivalent to future indicatives; they all possess a definite modal meaning; and for their proper understanding a correct conception of the relation between temporal and modal ideas in modal expressions is necessary.

¹ Sonnenschein, *C.R.* XXXII., p. 20; *The Year's Work* for 1917, pp. 36 ff.; Goodrich, *C.R.* XXXI. pp. 83 ff.; Pearson, *C.Q.* XI. pp. 66 f.

If the study of modal syntax had started with the periphrastic modes of English or of some other language, more than one misconception might have been avoided. Consider English modal expressions with the auxiliaries. In 'I can go' the assertion is directly made concerning the notion of 'can,' that is to say ability is asserted. Of the idea of going nothing is directly asserted.¹ A temporal meaning is, of course, expressed, but it is 'can,' the modal idea, that is placed in present time. Of the time of 'go' nothing is said. From the nature of the case, however, its time can not be before the time of 'can.' By implication, and implication only, the time of 'go' is a non-past. Only factors of context can make its time more definitely present or future.

If the expression is put into the past, 'I could (was able to) go,' it is the ability again that is placed in the past time sphere; and the time of 'go' is left indefinite, as in the case of 'I can go.'

What has been said may be applied to our 'compulsive'² expression or expression of 'external determination,'³ as I prefer to call it. In 'I am to go,' 'I was to go,' the temporal meanings belong to 'am' and 'was.' In neither case is the time of 'go' expressed.

The dictum that the temporal meaning of a modal expression is the time of the modal idea, not that of the verbal idea, should be applied to the modal forms of Latin,⁴ and of other languages

as well. A volitive subjunctive, as *faciamus*, expresses the will of the speaker in regard to a contemplated action. It places in the present time sphere not that contemplated action but the idea of willing. The time of doing is no more expressed than it is in *volo facere*. But in a clause of motive, since the act of the clause can not take place until the act of the antecedent clause has taken place, a future implication exists. In a sense consistent with this fact the subjunctive in a motive clause is 'prospective.'

Now the modal meaning of a large number of independent subjunctives and of the majority of subjunctives in subordinate clauses is not volitive or optative; it is 'compulsive,' 'of external determination.' Whether in independent sentences or in subordinate clauses the time expressed is that belonging to the modal idea. In *Trin.* 496 'ubi mortuos sis, ita sis' (the time of being dead) is left entirely indefinite. In subjunctive questions as 'Quid faciam?' (What am I to do?) there may be a somewhat more definite 'prospective' implication.

In subordinate clauses there are opportunities for a contextual implication of futurity. In the *priusquam* and *antequam* and *dum* clauses the conjunctions themselves tend to place the act or situation in the future in relation to the act of the main clause. The subjunctive does not place the act in the future; it expresses a modal idea. The 'priusquam conetur' of *Cic. De Or.* 2. 44. 186, means 'before he is to attempt.' The present time indicated by the tense of the verb has reference to the modal idea just as in the equivalent English expression the time expressed is the time of 'is.' So in 'priusquam manus consererent' of *Tusc.* 4. 22. 49, the past time expressed is the time of the modal idea, 'was.' In both cases there is a 'prospective' implication for the act of the clause.⁵ 'Delitui dum vela darent'

junctive and those with the perfect and the problem of the sequence of tenses.

⁵ When we assign to the subjunctive of the *priusquam* and *antequam* clauses the meaning of external determination, the difficulty met with in such examples as the following vanishes. *Liv.* 5. 33. 5. 'ducentis quippe annis antequam Clusium oppugnarent in Italian transcenderunt.,

¹ This, by the way, is the background of truth in the conception of the subjunctive as the mode of the act conceived, of pure thought, etc. In any modal expression the act itself, since its existence is not asserted, is in a sense merely thought of.

² See Sweet, *New English Grammar*, § 2297.

³ The term 'determined futurity' which I employed in two articles in *Classical Weekly* (X. pp. 178-181 and 185-188 and XI. pp. 161-164 and 169-172) is objectionable because it implies that the subjunctive expresses futurity. With the English 'compulsive' cf. the use of *est* and infinitive in Augustine *Civ. D.* 7. 3 'nam seminibus nasci in terra et ex terra est' and the use of *habeo* and infinitive, the forerunner of the Romance future and conditional. See Draeger, *Hist. Syn.* 2, § 414.

⁴ It has an important bearing on several important problems in Latin modal syntax, for example, the problem of the difference in meaning between prohibitions with the present sub-

of Virg. *Aen.* 2. 136, means 'I lay in hiding under the circumstances that (= till) they were bound to be sailing.' The past time of 'they were bound' is expressed by the imperfect tense. That the act of sailing lies in the future is a necessary implication of the context.

The same subjunctive appears in the so-called clauses of 'actual' result;¹ but the 'prospective' implication appears in but few cases. In Cic. *Am.* 9. 29, 'tanta vis probitatis est, ut eam etiam in hosti diligamus,' the time of loving is altogether indefinite, now or in the future. But in *Rud.* 730 'ita ego te hinc ornatum amittam tu ipse te ut non noveris,' the 'prospective' implication is clear. In both cases the time expressed (present) is that of the modal idea.

Nor in relative clauses is there such a thing as a 'prospective' subjunctive. In relative clauses Latin frequently chooses to speak of an act as (because of circumstances) bound to happen, rather than as happening; using, therefore, the subjunctive of external deter-

mination. In *Tusc.* 1. 18 'sunt qui censeant' Cicero says, 'there are those who are (bound) to be holding the opinion.' The time of the modal idea is present and is expressed by the tense of the verb. Nothing in the context places the time of *censere* in the future. But when Horace, *Od.* 1. 32 says 'si quid . . . lusimus tecum, quod et hunc in annum vivat et plures,' the phrase 'hunc in annum et plures' gives a 'prospective' implication. There is no shift in the nature of the subjunctive. So in Liv. 21. 42. 2 'se quisque eum optabat, quem fortuna in id certamen legeret,' the meaning of *optabat* serves to place the act of *legeret* in the future; but the time of the modal idea is, as it should be, past, the time indicated by the imperfect tense. The subjunctive in the so-called relative clauses of purpose has as good right as any to be called 'prospective'—Caes. *B.G.* 2. 17 'exploratores mittit qui locum idoneum castris deligant,' 'who are to select.' The 'prospective' implication is given in the same way as it is in the true purpose clause.

In *cum* subjunctive clauses we have the same situation. There, too, the Roman often preferred to speak of the act as bound to happen rather than as happening; and sometimes the context will indicate that the act or situation of the clause lies in the future relative to the time indicated by the tense of the subjunctive. So, for example, in Virg. *Aen.* 7. 427.

What has been said may easily be applied to Greek subjunctives and optatives. They, too, are strictly modal in meaning; but we should expect to find that occasionally the context places the contemplated act in the future. The optatives discussed by Mr. Pearson are 'prospective' only in this sense.

FRANK H. FOWLER.

Clearly the act of *oppugnarent* was not expected or anticipated or in prospect; but it was to be. See Hale, *Anticipatory*, p. 86 f.

¹ The real character of the subjunctive in these clauses has been quite clearly stated by Mr. Sonnenschein, *Unity*, pp. 36 ff.; but what he sees as the fundamental and unifying meaning of the Latin subjunctive—'obligation'—is nothing but the essential character of modal ideas in general. It belongs to the Greek optative and to the English periphrastic modal expressions. The meaning of external determination is as distinct from the volitive meaning as either is from that of capacity, meaning of English 'can.' To place volitive and compulsive subjunctives under one head, as Mr. Sonnenschein does, is to neglect the most important distinction in Latin modal syntax. The failure to make this sharp distinction keeps him from seeing that in a purpose clause we have to do with a clause of *willed* result, while in a 'result' clause we have to do with an *externally determined* result.

NOTES

EPIMENIDES AND
'MAXANIDUS.'

IN Vol. XXX. pp. 33 ff. and pp. 139 ff. of this *Review*, there are articles by Mr. Nicklin and Mr. Powell dealing with the discovery by Dr. Rendel Harris¹ in the Syriac commentary on the Acts of Isho'dad of Merv of a passage cited from 'Minos son of Zeus,' in which occurs not only the line *Κρήτες ἀεὶ ψεύσται, κακὰ θήρια, γαστέρες ἀργαί* (Tit. i. 12), but also the words 'in thee we live and move and have our being' (Acts xvii. 18),² and the further discovery by the same scholar that in his commentary on Titus the author states that the line *Κρήτες ἀεὶ ψεύσται κ.τ.λ.* is the work of a Cretan poet or prophet variously called MKSNNYDWS and Minos.³ In these articles Mr. Nicklin agrees with Dr. Harris in taking MKSNNYDWS to be a corruption of Ἐπιμενίδης, and supposing the citation to be derived from the *Minos* of Epimenides, while Mr. Powell disputes this conclusion, and is inclined to accept the conjecture of Professor Margoliouth that the name is a corruption of *Καλλίμαχος ἐν ὕμνοῖς*, based upon Clement, *Protrept.* II. 37, in which these words occur. None of those who have discussed the point has however noticed that the strange name also occurs in the so-called Zacharias Rhetor I. v. (Land, *Anecd. Syr.* III. p. 16, l. 25; transl. Krüger and Ahrens, p. 18*, l. 10),⁴ where we find the following passage: 'As he said, according to⁵ (?) MKSNYDYS a prophet of their own, "The Cretans are always liars, etc."' The letters KSN are very indistinct in the MS., but the passage in Isho'dad leaves scarcely any doubt

that Land (who had the advantage of seeing the MS. fifty years earlier) has read them correctly.⁶ 'Zacharias' wrote in 569, and the chapter in which the citation occurs consists of a supposed letter attributed to Moses of Ingila, the translator of the *Glaphyra* of Cyril, who lived about 550, and forming a preface to the version of the *Book of Joseph and Asenath* ascribed to Moses. That Isho'dad followed 'Zacharias' we cannot suppose; for, even if we could believe that he used Monophysite authorities, a commentator would not be likely to take an isolated passage from a historical writer; and both must therefore have drawn directly or indirectly from a common source, which was probably either a Syriac version of a Greek commentary on the epistles or a corrupt text of a Syriac commentary. Professor Margoliouth's suggestion as to the origin of the name is ingenious and attractive; but, if we accept it, we have to take the identity of the last five letters with the last five letters of Ἐπιμενίδης (more conspicuous in the text of 'Zacharias') as a mere coincidence; and as Greek words and names often appear in the strangest disguises in Syriac, the theory that MKSNYDYS is a corruption of Ἐπιμενίδης seems much more likely, though it is possible that the name has been formed by running together the names of Callimachus and Epimenides, who are mentioned in conjunction by Jerome and other commentators.⁷

E. W. BROOKS.

THE ACTS, XV. 29.

The Quarterly for January, 1919, p. 12, discussing W. E. Gladstone's conjectural emendation for Acts xv. 29, ἀπέχεσθαι εἰδωλοθύτων καὶ αἵματος καὶ

¹ *Expositor*, 7th ser., II., pp. 305 ff., III., pp. 332 ff.; 8th ser., IV., pp. 348 ff., IX., pp. 29 ff.; see also Introduction to Mrs. Gibson's edition of Isho'dad vol. IV., pp. xii ff.

² Ed. Gibson, IV., p. 40; transl. p. 29.

³ *Id.* V., p. 146; transl. p. 99.

⁴ In my new text of 'Zach.' for the *Corp. Scr. Christ. Orient.* p. 19, l. 15.

⁵ Or 'of.' The text is perhaps corrupt.

⁶ When sending my text to press, I did not know of the passage in Isho'dad, and have therefore left the three letters blank as too uncertain to print.

⁷ See above, vol. XXX., p. 35.

πνικτῶν¹ καὶ πορρείας, where he wished to read πορκείας, thus making the whole verse 29 dietetic, like a modern rations card, says the word πορκεία is not in L. and S. πόρκος, however, is, with the reference to Plut., Popli., and πορκεία comes as easily from πόρκος as πορρεία from πόρνος. The eating of pigs' flesh in this connexion is as congruous to the context as πορρεία is abhorrent.

H. H. JOHNSON.

NOTES ON HORACE.

C. i. 14.

O navis, referent in mare te novi fluctus! O quid agis? fortiter occupa portum!

HORACE often begins a sentence with a comparative adverb: *parcius*, i. 25, 1; *latius*, ii. 2, 9; *rectius*, ii. 10, 1, and iv. 9, 46. In such cases a comparison-essential to the sense, is justly emphasised by position. *Fortiter occupa portum*, however, is the only sentence in the *Odes* that begins with an adjectival adverb not in the comparative degree. The word *fortiter* is therefore marked as exceptionally significant. Why, then, is it ignored in translations? Lytton: 'What wouldst thou? Make fast, O, make fast for the haven!' Calverley: 'What dost thou? Seek a haven and there rest thee.' Conington: 'Oh, haste to make the haven yours!' What instinct constrains these faithful translators to strike out an adverb so highly distinguished by the poet? The answer seems to be that they were aware, consciously or subconsciously, not that *fortiter* is otiose, but that it is ruinous to the sense. The virtue displayed by a skipper who runs for harbour because his ship is no longer seaworthy is *prudentia*, not *fortitudo*; and the purpose of the ode is to commend to statesmen a cautious and pacific rather than a courageous policy. *Fortiter* is therefore exactly the wrong word.

Sense may be restored by amending the punctuation:

O quid agis fortiter? Occupa portum!

'Why this untimely display of courage? Make harbour!' It will be objected that the rhythmical balance is upset; that the unqualified *occupa portum!* is intolerably abrupt; that it sounds like a shout—an effect suitable to a ballad (as Scott's 'Charge, Chester, charge!' or Macaulay's 'Grasp your pikes! close your ranks!') but not agreeable to the suave movement of a Horatian ode. I reply (1) that, in any case, the stanza is exceptional, representing in its asyndeta and sharp transitions the excitement of one who watches a ship in distress; (2) that the shouting effect is repeated with greater abruptness in *cave!* below, a sudden imperative for which the reader is in no way prepared by the protasis *nisi ventis debes ludibrium*.

C. A. VINCE.

Serm. II. 1, §86:

Solventur risu tabulae, tu missus abibis.

The poet wishes to feel free to attack individuals after the manner of Lucilius. His friend Trebatius, the lawyer, dissuades him, pointing out that he would be liable to prosecution. The question is, what would be the outcome of such a trial? Trebatius, on hearing Horace's proposed defence, thinks he would get off, expressing the manner of his escape by *solventur risu tabulae*.

It is apparent from *risu* that a part of the imagined proceedings was the reading to the court of the incriminating verses. They would be found to be of excellent literary quality, and directed only against those who deserved reproof (the author being of blameless character). It is also clear from the use of *missus* (instead of *absolutus*) that the poet, as the result of his wit and cleverness, would be let off, but not formally acquitted. This implies that the trial was brought to a halt and the case abandoned. This could come about through the retirement of the accuser from the case, his mere absence from the court being sufficient. Several

¹ πνικτῶν V. L. (LTTr) πνικτοῦ.

instances of this kind are known,¹ so that there is no inherent difficulty in the matter of procedure. It is quite possible, however, that the case came to an end with the mere rising of the court, which, of course, was one of the *quaestiones perpetuae*.² In the older trials before the people the assembly might be broken up by the disappearance of the flag from Janiculum, as in the case of Rabirius,³ or by internal tumult. It is the latter situation which Horace in harmonious fashion may be seeking to re-echo, *risu* arousing associations with *tumultu*.

We are now in a position to consider the meaning of *tabulae*, which is taken variously as indictment (Palmer), writing tablets (Orelli), benches of the jurymen (Porphyrio), the satires themselves (Zeune), the laws (Schütz), and the praetor's formula in the case (Lejay). 'The exact meaning of *tabulae*,' says Morris, 'cannot be determined.' If, however, one has occasion to busy himself with legal texts he receives an abiding impression of the frequent use of *tabulae* in governmental administration. On looking more closely he finds they are kept by quaestors, praetors, censors, election officers, and municipal senates, and are nothing more or less than official records. In the *lex Acilia repetundarum* the *tabulae* contain the names of the jurors and the attorneys. That they were also records of the proceedings in court is shown by an important (but overlooked) passage in a letter of Caelius to Cicero describing a case against Servilius.⁴ The jury was evenly divided, and the praetor thereupon gave a verdict for the defendant. Thinking later that he had misinterpreted the law 'he did not enter the defendants on the records as acquitted, but merely wrote out the verdicts of the

several *decuriae* '—'in *tabulas absolutum non rettulit, ordinum iudicia perscripsit.*' It is evident from this not only that *tabulae* were court records, but also (what seems not to have been recognised hitherto) they were kept by the presiding praetor. In our passage *tabulae* are the records of the proceedings in the case against Horace. When the court adjourns the hearing in its amusement at his witty verses, they are cancelled (*solventur*⁵); the case, as we say, is stricken from the docket, and the poet walks out a free man.

Epp. II. 3, 120-3:

Scriptor honoratum si forte reponis Achillem,
Impiger, iracundus, inexorabilis, acer
Iura neget sibi nata, nihil non arroget armis.

The point I wish to discuss here is the use of *honoratum*. On the ground that Achilles is not honoured in the *Iliad* and, that if he were, it would be unsuitable to speak of him as *iracundus*, etc., Bentley conjectured *Homereum* and printed it in his text. In this he was followed by Munro in 1869, and later by L. Müller, who read *Homeriacum*. However, *honoratum* is now usually retained, though the medium assigned to it varies. Krüger thinks it should be completed by *fama*; Wilkins takes it as 'when in receipt of his due honours,' Rolfe as 'restored to honour in distinction from his situation at the beginning of the *Iliad*.' The latest discussion of the passage by Frederick Pollock brings out this same point. He says, '*re* of *reponis* must mean something. It cannot mean to restore to the stage in the modern theatrical sense of revival, for the whole passage deals with the treatment of stock motives and characters. The emphatic position of *honoratum* has been overlooked. The dramatist undertakes to restore Achilles to his worshipful standing: therefore, I would translate, In case you take for your subject Achilles' Worship Restored.'

All this is to make a difficulty of what would seem to be simple enough. *Hono-*

¹ Cf. *Lex Acil.* 70 (Bruns' *Fontes*, p. 70) for ways of hindering a trial, and see the cases of retirement of accusers cited by Greenidge in *Legal Procedure of Cicero's Time*, p. 468, n. 1. Cf. also *Orationes Claudii*, Bruns, pp. 98-9.

² *Cic. pro Balb.* 28, 65: 'Cum omnium peccatorum quaestiones sint,' quoted by Greenidge, p. 427.

³ Strachan-Davidson, *Roman Criminal Law*, i. 201; Botsford, *Roman Assemblies*, p. 258.

⁴ See 26, Bruns, p. 64.

⁵ 2 *Fam.* viii. 8, 3.

⁶ Cf. *Cic. de Or.* ii. 58, 236: *res . . . ioco risuque dissolvit.*

Quint. v. 10, 67: *cum risu tota res solvitur.*

Class. Rev. XXXI. 52 (March, 1917).

ratum is the use, common enough in the Augustan age, of a perfect participle in agreement with noun to express a verbal idea. Thus Livy (XXI. 46, 10) says *servati consulis decus*, and *huius belli perfecti laus*. The idiom is frequent in Horace, and in an article¹ on *Sat. I. 6, 126*, I have brought together a virtually complete collection of the examples. It is somewhat strange how scholars have stumbled over this construction, a classic example being the great Ribbeck's comment² on Juvenal X. 110. In answer to the question: What overthrew men like Pompey and Crassus and Caesar? Juvenal writes: 'Summus nempe locus nulla non arte petitus,' whereupon Ribbeck remarks: 'Wie kann der höchste Stand oder der Gipfel der Macht Jemanden zu Boden stürzen?' In our passage *honoratum . . . Achillem* means 'the honouring of Achilles,' the reference being of course to the embassy. Achilles was certainly honoured on this occasion, whatever be his treatment in the rest of the *Iliad*. If a writer wishes to portray him after Homer (hence *reponere*), he must be true to type—'Famam sequere aut sibi convenientia finge,' as the poet remarks in verse 119. Specifically Horace has in mind the behaviour of Achilles at the embassy, although the description he gives of him there might also apply to his character in general.

JEFFERSON ELMORE.

Stanford University.

CICERO'S LETTERS TO ATTICUS, XV. 9.

[No. 742 in Tyrrell and Purser's
Edition.]

Di immortales! quam me conturbatum tenuit epistulae tuae prior pagina? Quid autem iste in domo tua casus armorum?

THE explanations of this passage suggested in that fine edition of Cicero's *Correspondence*, from which I copy the above passage, do not seem quite satisfactory. It is, as the editors suggest,

¹ *Class. Rev.* XIX. 400 ff. (November, 1905).

² *Der Echte und der Unechte Juvenal*, p. 54.

unlikely that there should be a 'fracas' in such a sedate establishment as that of Atticus. On the other hand, the emendation *casus armarium*, 'fall of cupboards,' would hardly explain the very remarkable sentence that precedes; unless we take Cicero's alarm to be counterfeited and suppose the sentence to be jocular. This does not seem very likely, for the rest of the letter is in a vein of deep despondency. A few days later he says 'βλάβφημα mittamus,' and less than a fortnight from the present date he writes 'mihi res ad caedem et eam quidem propinquam spectare videtur.'

Is it not possible that the phrase *casus armorum* means simply 'the fall of arms'—i.e., some weapon, or weapons, in Atticus's house fell down without apparent reason, and this was taken by both Atticus and Cicero as an omen of war? This would explain the alarm expressed in 'Di immortales! quam me conturbatum tenuit. . . .' It would also account for the anticipations of war that Cicero now begins to indulge in. Superstition, of course, was part and parcel of Roman life, and it is not likely that Cicero was entirely exempt from it. If this view is correct, we have an exact parallel in Scott's *Lady of the Lake*, Canto I., stanza 27, where Douglas's sword falls to the floor at the approach of Fitzjames. In Canto II., stanza 15, the old minstrel explains this as an omen of the approach of a secret foe.

When we find Livy, in spite of a sort of apology, carefully reporting wearisome crops of prodigies every year, we need not hesitate to ascribe superstition to Cicero.

H. W. M. BURD.

VIRGIL, *AEN.* VII. 7. 641 ff.

MR. WARDE FOWLER in his interesting book, *Virgil's Gathering of the Clans*, says (p. 42), 'there is no very intelligible geographical order in the show.' But there is a method of arrangement, which I, or perhaps one of my pupils (I forget now), detected some time ago. Mezentius leads—the impious Mezen-

tius against pious Aeneas, as Servius said; and it is natural enough that Turnus and Camilla should close the procession. But what of the eleven chiefs who come in between? It is enough to set down their names in the order they are given: Aventinus, Catillus and Coras, Caeculus (Messapus), Clausus, Halaesus, Oebalus, Ufens, Umbro, Virbius. The order is obviously alphabetical. Messapus, however, is out of place. I do not imagine that the poet set any store on this alphabetical arrangement, or would have cared about disturbing it. But the difficulties of the Messapus-passage are great; the awkward zeugma (*habent acies and arcus*), the unfinished line (*pulsa palus*), and the almost comic effect of the two similes in juxtaposition (*canoros, raucarum*); not to mention that Messapus is in another way out of place—the eponymous hero of Messapia with such followers. The paragraph was at least left by Virgil in an unrevised state, perhaps at the foot of the page or in the margin, and the editors were troubled. I should like to transpose them to the alphabetical place after Halaesus, for one would thus restore what I fancy was the intention—to mention the arms of the followers, beginning with Mezentius down to Virbius, only in every other case. It is true that special arms should be given to Umbro's troops, but the paragraph ends in a broken line. It may well be that for the time Virgil was puzzled as to what arms to give them, when he had already had recourse even to aclydes—boomerangs, as Mr. J. Y. Powell has shown. I would add on the question of unfinished lines that both Mr. Mackail (*C.R.*, December, 1915) and Mr. Fowler (p. 93) have missed two; there are 57, not 55 of them. The missing two are, I suspect, 2,787 *Dardanis et divae Veneris nurus*, and 5,815 *unum pro multis dabitur caput*. A. M. COOK.

VIRGIL, AENEID, VIII. 23.

IN his *Aeneas at the site of Rome* Warde Fowler has again explained many obscurities in Virgil, but he has left the old crux of VIII. 23, with an admission

of its difficulty. The lines in question are:

sicut aquae tremulum labris ubi lumen aenis
sole *percutsum* aut radiantis imagine lunae
omnia pervolat late loca.

Some commentators assume a mixed figure that borrows the language of the mint (*percutio nummum*), others a confused picture caused by the poet's carelessness in referring the point of reflection to the sun instead of to the water. But the precision of Virgil's visual sense can seldom be questioned with impunity. Perhaps the difficulty will vanish if we read the passage with the Epicurean conception of light in mind. From Siro and Lucretius Virgil had learned that light was a succession of particles emitted from its source in a constant stream. Indeed, he may here have had in mind the striking lines of Lucretius, IV. 189, 190:

suppeditatur enim confestim lumine lumen
et quasi protelo stimulat fulgure fulgur.

At any rate the Epicurean theory underlies such phrases of Virgil as 'aera . . . sole laccessita' (VII. 527) and 'quaerit pars semina flammae abstrusa in venis silicis' (VI. 6).

The simple form *percutsum* would have caused less difficulty, but the prefix *re* does not necessarily mean 'back' or 'again.' It sometimes has the force of 'down' (*reclinis, reclinis*), it may be intensive as in *redundo*, or it may imply continuity as in *respiro, reverere, redolere*. The passage seems therefore to mean: As when light, emitted by sun or moon, shimmering on the water, flits about.

I may add that except for the strange Pythagoreanism¹ of the sixth book, which was apparently assumed for reasons of plot, the whole of the *Aeneid* is best comprehended as the work of an Epicurean poet. And in so far I would question Warde Fowler's discussion of Fate (*ibid.* pp. 122-9). Virgil's inconsequential *Fatum* may be understood in the light of Lucretius II. 250-307, and his histrionic divinities are explained by Lucretius II. 600-660.

TENNEY FRANK.

Bryn Mawr, Penna.

¹ The poet, of course, did not seriously believe in an abode where souls appeared before birth in their future attributes.

TWO PASSAGES OF VIRGIL.

Aen. VIII. 376-378:

non ullum auxilium miseris, non arma rogavi
 artis opisque tuae, nec te, carissime coniunx,
 incassumve tuos volui exercere labores
 378 incassumque *M. pr. man.*

'As it seems to me, a very ill-elaborated passage, both in respect of sound and sense,' says Henry of the whole of 377-381; and it must be allowed that we have here a rough patch which wanted the poet's *ultima manus*. All the more, therefore, does it behove us not lightly to call in question the correctness of the text offered by our MSS. Despite this, and despite the fact that, from the very nature of the Virgilian tradition, the textual critic pipes always to readers who will not dance (nor do I very much blame them), I am moved to make a suggestion upon the text of line 378.

It is Latin, and it is Virgilian, to say *labor aliquem exercet* (see *Aen.* I. 431). It is Latin, and Virgilian, to say *labore aliquem exerceo* (see *Aen.* VIII. 412). It is Latin, though the phrase does not occur in Virgil, to say *aliquis exercet labores*: Virgil has *vires, iras, vices, exercere*, all of which are analogous; nor are *choros, cantus, exercere* much dissimilar. *humum exerceo, taurum exerceo* are Latin and Virgilian. But, unless one is addressing a field, or a beast of the field, is *te exerceo* Latin for 'I make you work, I work you'? and is *exerceo tuos labores* Latin for it either? or are the two together, with a connecting *-ve* (or even a *-que*), Latin for it? No editor seems to feel any doubt of it in this passage; and that the conjunct phrase, as = *te tuis laboribus exerceo*, is impossible it would be rash to affirm. But it is at least questionable.

A small change would rid us of all difficulty. I would suggest that the true reading in 378 is *incassum vetitos volui*: 'I did not desire (indeed it had been vain) that you should labour at forbidden toils.' The conjecture derives support from Vulcan's reply in lines 395-404. 'If you had asked me for arms,' he there says in effect, 'when Troy was about to fall, you would have

found that the labour you call *forbidden* could have been allowed:

similis si cura fuisset
 tum quoque fas nobis Teucros armare fuisset;
 nec pater omnipotens Troiam nec fata *veta-*
bant 398
 stare, decemque alios Priamum superesse per
 annos.'

nec vetabant in line 398 lacks point (and is even obscure) if Venus has not referred to a supposed decree of fate making it *nefas* for Vulcan to make arms for Aeneas at Troy. *vetitos* in 378 supplies the required reference. *nec . . . vetabant* is rendered by Conington 'the fates did not forbid (if you had only known it).' With *vetitos* it will mean 'you were wrong when you said that the fates forbade.'

Aen. XII. 93-97:

validam vi corripit hastam,
 Actoris Aurunci spolum, quassatque trementem
 vociferans: 'nunc, o numquam frustrata vocatus
 hasta meos, nunc tempus adest: te maximus
 Actor,
 te Turni nunc dextra gerit.'

96. 'te maximus Actor: understand *antea gessit*,' says Conington. But is *Actor* here a proper name? or should we write *actor* (*te maximus actor nunc gerit*)? Statius has *actor habenae* (*Ach.* II. 134); and *actor hastae* is equally natural. Statius may very well have borrowed *actor* in this sense from Virgil. The play on the proper name *Actor* is quite in Virgil's manner. Thus at III. 183 he has *cassus Cassandra canebat* (*cassus Postgate: casus codd.*), and at VII. 791 *argumentum ingens et custos virginis Argus*.

H. W. GARROD.

Merton College, Oxford.

CATULLUS 39, 11 *PARCUS*
UMBER.

IN 1894 were published some extracts from the *Liber Glossarum*, a huge encyclopaedia-dictionary which I believe (but cannot prove) to have been compiled at Corbie in the abbacy of Adelard (from about the year 775). Since they appeared in vol. V. of the *Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum* they have been ignored in this country, where Latin

Glossaries are by common consent relegated to the Gentiles' Court as things remote from the orthodox devotion of English Latinists, devotion to the conjectural emendation of the text of a few Latin poets. Yet they contain things that should interest all of us. They tell us, for example (on the authority of a lost *Vita Vergiliana*), that Virgil was called to the bar but held only one brief (*C.G.L.* V. 249, 17 'togam est consecutus; egit causam non amplius quam unam'). And they emend (without conjecture's precarious aid) a line of Catullus. One of the sources used by the Corbie compiler was a Collection of Examples (of the meaning of words) from Authors. The meaning of *pinguis* was there illustrated by Catull. 39, 11:

aut pinguis Umber aut obesus Etruscus,
a very suitable line, since it contrasts *pinguis* with *obesus*, the sleek embonpoint of the dairy-farmer of Sassina with the unhealthy 'undistributed middle' of the sensual Etrurian. How did *parcus* find its way into our MSS. of Catullus?

In that 'editio illepidi' of a lepidus poeta, that warning example how palaeography should *not* be used by an editor, the Teubner commentary of Friedrich, it is declared that Catullus wrote *pastus*, of which *parcus* is a faulty transcription and *pinguis* a gloss. But that Catullus wrote *pinguis* is, we may say, proved by the *pinguibus Umbris* of Persius (3, 74). *Parcus* may be a conjectural emendation of some miswriting of *pinguis*, or it may be a deliberate alteration by some Umbrian scribe of the archetype. Ellis thinks it may belong to a second ancient recension.

In the apparatus of the Oxford (Script. Class. Bibl.) text we find '... pinguis Gloss. Vatic. in Maii Class. Auct. VII. 574 Pinguis: grassus; nam obesus plus est quam pinguis: Catullus ait "Aut pinguis," etc. But how meaningless all this is to a reader! How differently it impresses him when he is told that Mai found the gloss in an inferior MS. of the Liber Glossarum; that the compiler of the Liber Glossarum took it from a Collection of Examples from Authors which is quite as likely to have been an ancient collection (like Arusianus Messius' *Quadrigena*) as a Carolingian (like Mico's *Prosody*), since much of its

lore can be traced to Donatus (*Class. Quart.* XI. 128). And how necessary it becomes to elicit from the chief MSS. of the Liber Glossarum all possible information about this lost work! Goetz has published only extracts. But we must get all the items of the Liber Glossarum published which have come from this source.

And that is the object of this article. Are there half a dozen teachers of Latin in this country who have enough zeal for research to be willing to spend their forenoons for a week (or, still better, a fortnight) in one or other of the following libraries, where are the oldest MSS. of this Corbie dictionary: the Bibliothèque Nationale of Paris, the Vaticana of Rome, the Bibliothèque de Ville of Tours, the Stadtbibliothek of Berne, the Königliche Bibliothek of Munich, the Ambrosiana of Milan? If there are, and if they will write to me, so that their labours may be distributed and directed, the thing will be done.

W. M. LINDSAY.

The University, St. Andrews.

THE DERIVATION OF LATIN 'RUDIS' QUASI SINGLESTICK.

It is deplorable to go backward in our scientific knowledge, but this is what has happened in regard to the etymology of Lat. *rudis*. Stowasser, in his Latin lexicon of 1900, explained the noun *rudis* by adding after it 'sc. *uirga hasta*'; and under the adjective he cited the Virgilian instance, viz. *Aeneid* IX. 743,

ille rudem nodis et cortice crudo
intorquet . . . hastam.

This passage certainly suggests that the *rudis* was first a sort of knobkerry or an unwrought singlestick. This good explanation was silently withdrawn in Skutsch's revision of Stowasser in 1910. In 1915 Zimmerman, in his etymological lexicon, revived the suggestion—but, if I may say so, very coldly. Walde has disdained even to mention it.

One interested in root derivation might be disposed to connect the noun *ru-dis* directly with *ru-trum* and *rutabulum*, from a root *ru* (see Walde s.v. *ruo*), to scratch, so that the original sense of *rutrum rutabulum* will have

been 'scratcher, digging stick.' Even then it seems to me that Lat. *rudis* (rough < scratching) is earlier than *rudis*, knobkerry. Latin (from Greek) *ruta* (rue) will have meant, to start with, the rough plant or the plant of rough taste (cf. Lat. *asper*, of wine, brine). The root of *rudis* will be ultimately not different from the root of Eng. *rough*, Lat. *rau-cus*, rough of voice. This raises the question of the ultimate cognation of *rudis* (rough) and *rudis* (howls). Did the sense of 'grating' come from 'howling' or conversely? We should be cautious not to disbelieve the one or the other if we recall that, in point of derivation, Eng. *smooth* meant, to start with, 'creamy.'

But waving all question of the remoter cognates, I wish to record myself as entirely satisfied with Stowasser's derivation of the noun *rudis* (sc. *uirga hasta*) from the adjective *rudis* (rough). Cf. the Spanish noun *largo* (billiard cue), from Lat. *largus* (broad, expansive), though *largus* must in Spanish have got the sense of 'long' prior to the development of the nominal sense of 'cue.'

EDWIN W. FAY.

The University of Texas.

LIVY II. 30. 4.

sed curae fuit consulibus et senioribus patrum, ut imperio suo vehemens mansueto permitteretur ingenio.

As the above passage stands in the MSS., there is no subject for 'permitteretur.' This difficulty is fully discussed by Professor Conway in his edition of Livy II. (C.U.P. 1912, p. 134), who takes Moritz Müller's suggestion and prints MAGISTRATUS between 'vehemens' and 'mansueto.' It seems evident that some word closely akin to 'imperio' and 'magistratus' has dropped out of the text, probably through haplography. Professor Conway mentions two proposals that have been made, but does not accept them. They are: (1) '*Imperii vis vehemens*' (Madvig); (2) '*Imperium sua vi vehemens*' (Frigell). Each of these proposals involves a twofold tampering with the text, apart from Professor Conway's objection (*loc. cit.*).

The present writer suggests the insertion of MUNUS after 'vehemens.' MUNUS

would be more likely to fall out between VEHEMENS and MANSUETO than would MAG^{RS}. (abbreviated for 'magistratus').

For MUNUS used in connexion with a magistracy, cp. est proprium munus magistratus, intellegere, se gerere personam civitatis (Cicero, *De Off.* I. 34. 124).

M. KEAN.

*Collegiate School,
Liverpool.*

LIVY XXI. 48. 8.

'Nummis aureis quadringentis Dasio Brundisino praefecto praesidii corrupto, traditur Hannibali Clastidium.'

With hardly an exception, commentators have fallen foul of the words 'nummis aureis.'¹ On the authority of a statement of Pliny² they declare that gold coins were not struck in Rome before 217 B.C.,³ and conclude that Livy's allusion to them in connexion with events of 218 B.C. must be an anachronism.

This anachronism, if it be one, certainly does not stand alone in the pages of Livy, whose antiquarian accuracy was not above reproach. Yet Livy was certainly aware that in the earlier days of the Roman republic large sums of money were paid by weight.⁴ And the knowledge of this fact is not likely to have slipped from him in the present case, for in the above passage his method of expression is somewhat stilted and gives the impression of aiming at a studied effect. Our author therefore was on the alert, and we should think twice before we reproach him with a careless blunder.

But on second thoughts the objections

¹ Nash (1874); Capes (1878); Dowdall (1885); Dimsdale (1888); Tatham (1889); Traves (1899); Allcroft and Hayes (1902). Westcott (1892) tries to evade the difficulty by translating 'an amount of gold of the value of 400 aurei.' But this does excessive violence to Livy's language.

² *Hist. Naturalis* 33. 47: aureus nummus post annos li. percussus est quam argenteus.

³ This date, which some scholars reject in favour of 218 B.C., has recently been rehabilitated by Leuze (*Zeitschrift für Numismatik*, 1915, pp. 37-46).

⁴ *E.g.*, 22. 23. 3: argenti pondo bina et selibras in militem praestaret.

to Livy's version lose all their force. For one thing, it is by no means certain that Pliny's date for the first emission of gold coin at Rome is correct. Some leading numismatists have used the evidence of style—which is a safer criterion in expert hands than a second or third-hand snippet from Pliny—to date back the earliest extant gold pieces from the mint at Rome to the last years of the First Punic War, or to some other period anterior to the Second Punic War.¹ Again, it is quite arbitrary to assume that Hannibal's choice of gold coins was limited to the issues of the Roman moneyers. Indeed, if he paid in coin at all, he probably did not use Roman pieces. The earliest Roman gold coinage, whatever its date, was almost certainly an emergency issue. It was intended to cope with a stringency of money in Rome itself and therefore would not circulate widely outside the city. It is unlikely, therefore, that Hannibal could have hoarded a sufficient stock of these aurei to liquidate his transaction with Dasius. We should look beyond Rome for the provenance of the four hundred gold pieces.

Now if we take a survey of those mints whose coins might possibly have come into Hannibal's hands, we shall have to travel over quite a wide field. In Italy alone gold coins of the third century are known to have been struck at Veii, Capua, Heraclea, Tarentum, and among the Bruttii. In Sicily issues in the same metal were not uncommon in the fifth century, and in the third century the mint of Syracuse was singularly prolific of gold pieces. Carthage too issued gold currency in the early and middle part of the same century, and even some of the tribes of Gaul had followed suit.² Of the mints in the Eastern Mediterranean, it may suffice to mention that of the great Macedonian kings, Philip and Alexander.

Gold coins, therefore, were plentiful enough in Hannibal's time. And we

need not doubt that—setting aside the case of emergency issues—they had a wide circulation among the armies of that period, for they would be far more convenient to carry than the bulky silver pieces.³ Indeed some of the principal gold coinages, such as those of Syracuse and Tarentum, of Macedon and Carthage, and the pieces struck under Roman authority at Capua, were evidently meant in the first instance for military use. Their emission usually coincided with some important military effort, and was on such a scale as to exceed by far the needs of the local market.⁴ Almost any and every one of the issues above mentioned would have served Hannibal's purpose. The coins of Carthage would presumably be the easiest for him to come by; those of Macedon, and, in a less degree, of Syracuse and Tarentum, enjoyed the greatest international reputation; and the last-named were probably the most familiar to the recipient, a native of Brundisium.

But it is useless to break our heads in endeavouring to find in what particular species Hannibal paid Dasius. Suffice it to say that he probably had plenty of 'nummi aurei' of one sort or another at his disposal, and that there is no warrant for accusing Livy of inaccuracy in his description of Hannibal's bargain.

M. CARY.

University of London.

QUINTILIAN I. 9. 2.

I THINK it should be stated that the interpretation of this passage reprehended by Mr. F. H. Colson in the last number of the *CLASSICAL REVIEW* is assumed by M. L. Havet on p. xvi of his edition of 1895, where it is cited amongst the 'testimonia de Phaedro.'

J. P. POSTGATE.

¹ Grueber, *Coins of the Roman Republic*, introd. p. lv; vol. i., p. 12. Hill, *Historical Roman Coins*, pp. 40-43. Hill's date (c. 242 B.C.) commends itself strongly on historical grounds.

² Cf. Head, *Historia Numorum* and the *British Museum Catalogue of Coins*.

³ The inconvenience of silver money to an army in rapid motion is amusingly illustrated in Oman, *History of the Peninsular War*, vol. ii., p. 348.

⁴ This is particularly true of the copious issues described in Evans' *Horsemen of Tarentum*, pp. 81-2, 97, 140-1.

POMPEY'S COMPROMISE.

PROFESSOR TENNEY FRANK's suggestion¹ that Pompey's offer to prolong Caesar's command in Gaul till November 13, 49 B.C., was coupled with a provision for the insertion of two intercalary months in the early part of that year receives support from the following passage in Cicero's correspondence: 'leuissime enim, quia de intercalando non obtinuerat (Curio), transfugit ad populum' (*Ad Familiares* 8. 6. 5. Written by Caelius to Cicero in March, 50 B.C., some two months before Pompey made his offer to Caesar).

This passage shows that the question of calendar reform was in the air at the time when Pompey made his offer to Caesar. We do not know what attitude Pompey adopted towards Curio's scheme at the outset; but once Curio had abandoned his motion and left a free field to Pompey the latter had a double interest in reviving the question of intercalation. Not only, as Professor Frank points out, would a manipulation of the calendar enable him to make a specious offer to Caesar, but it would place his antagonist Curio in a dilemma. If Curio accepted Pompey's calendar reform, he would prejudice the interests of his patron Caesar. If he opposed it after himself introducing a similar or identical scheme, he would lay himself open to the charge of inconsistency. The second of these results, moreover, was one which Pompey was anxious to attain. His general policy of *riposte* against Curio at this time was to pretend that he, Pompey, and not Curio, was Caesar's true friend, that Curio was a mere irresponsible mischief-maker.²

¹ *Classical Review*, May-June, 1919, pp. 68-9.

² *Ad Familiares* 8. 11. 3: Pompeius, tamquam Caesarem non impugnet, sed quod illi aequum putet constituat aut Curionem quaerere discordias.

There is, therefore, good reason for believing that Professor Frank has offered a valid explanation of a difficulty which has long baffled historians.

M. CARY.

University of London.

NOSTRUM NOBIS.

IN *Archiv* 15. 47 (anno 1908; cf. *Kleine Schriften*, p. 321), in a paragraph entitled *Ersatz des Komparationskasus*, Skutsch wrote as follows: Woher dies quam gekommen ist, lässt sich mit einem Worte sagen—und doch ist es nirgends gesagt. . . . Genau so ist im Lateinischen *hic clarior est quam ille* statt *clarior est illo* eingetreten nach der Analogie von *hic tam clarus est quam ille*. But in the *Classical Review* 8. 458 (anno 1894) I had written: A very transparent origin for the Latin *quam* (than) can be made out, e.g. *tam ego fui liber quam* (sc. *liber*) *gnatus tuus* (Plautus, *Cpt.* 310); it is but a step to *liberior quam gnatus tuus*. Also in my edition of the *Mostellaria* (anno 1902) I presented the case for interaction between comparison of equality and comparison of inequality at least as thoroughly as Skutsch. To my examples I may now add from Wycherley's *Gentleman Dancing Master* (i. 2), Thou hast made the best use of three months at Paris as ever English squire did. In his small volume on Horace (ch. vi., p. 110 of the Lippincott edition) Sir Theodore Martin got two types of comparison of inequality into confusion, viz. in the sentence: 'the wife so chosen seems to have been at pains to make herself more attractive to everybody rather than to her husband.'

EDWIN W. FAY.

University of Texas.

REVIEWS

THE PRICE OF FREEDOM.

The Price of Freedom: An Anthology for All Nations, chosen by F. MELIAN STAWELL. $7\frac{1}{2} \times 4\frac{1}{2}$. Pp. 165. 24 illustrations. London: Headley Brothers. Price 3s. 6d. net.

MISS F. M. STAWELL, in her interesting collection of extracts from the poets and thinkers of many nations, does not shrink from contemplating the harsh and cruel sides of life, which emerge so often in the age-long struggle for freedom. Her little book may thus prove a useful corrective to the serene beauty of Mr. Bridges' great *Anthology*, which inspired it. Twenty-four illustrations are added, most of them being happily chosen, though Rembrandt's 'Anatomy Lesson' might well have been omitted. Miss Stawell draws on German writers (chiefly Goethe and Nietzsche) and also, rather largely, on Walt Whitman and Browning, all of whom were passed over by Mr. Bridges.

For the *Classical Review* the main interest of the book lies in its quotations from the classics. We are struck by the entire absence of Latin, except for a few lines from Spinoza. Is there nothing to be found in Livy or Tacitus, Virgil or the Roman Stoics, to hearten the world in its fight 'pulchra pro libertate' (*Aen.* VI. 821)? It is noteworthy that Mr. Bridges also allows classical Latin literature to be represented by a single passage from the *Aeneid*. Some lover of Latin ought to fill up this gap, if it can be filled. The

Greek quotations are nearly all well-known ones. Unfortunately only four out of fifteen appear with an absolutely accurate Greek text: mis-spellings and wrong accents abound. It is a pity that such mistakes should have been allowed to survive the proof-sheets. The translations are generally Miss Stawell's own: that of the Thermopylae epitaph—'Stranger, tell the Spartans that we have obeyed their orders, and have fallen here'—reads very flat: the emphasis is on $\tau\eta\delta\epsilon\ \kappa\epsilon\iota\mu\epsilon\theta\alpha$, 'here we lie,' and the noble lines almost demand a couplet in verse. Antigone's answer to Creon (*Soph. Antigone* 523) is admittedly a difficult line, for which a perfect rendering has perhaps not yet been found; but Miss Stawell's lengthy paraphrase sadly weakens it. For the Athenian battle-song in the *Persians* (402-5) Browning's rendering is used. In spite of Browning's name, one misses the steady rhythm of the Greek, and a printer's slip in punctuation does not improve matters. Plato furnishes but one quotation, of six words only; Thucydides none. Altogether the Greek extracts grip the reader far less than they ought to do.

It is only fair to add that the Greek forms a very small part of the book, and that the translations from the French and German are well done, especially two fine prose passages, one from Zola (p. 78) and one from Victor Hugo (p. 90).

G. W. BUTTERWORTH.

NATURAL SCIENCE AND THE CLASSICAL SYSTEM IN EDUCATION.

Natural Science and the Classical System in Education: Essays New and Old. Edited by Sir RAY LANKESTER. One volume. Pp. x+268. London: Heinemann, 1918. 2s. 6d. net.

THE Committee on the Neglect of Science have entrusted to Sir Ray

Lankester the publication of essays on 'Natural Science in Education,' by the Master of Balliol; on 'The Case against the Classical Languages' and 'A Modern Education,' by Mr. H. G. Wells; on 'Science and Educational Reconstruction,' by Mr. F. W. Sanderson; and 'The Aim of Education,' by the editor.

The last essay is a trumpet-call, as loud as possible, intended to rally the friends of science against their supposed enemy, the tradition of classical teaching.

In discussing the value of these essays I shall try to set out the lists for the encounter between the combatants as accurately as is needful. It might have been hoped that the champion of science as against the classics, the editor, would have anticipated the necessary explanations. But his command of scientific procedure is not adequate for the discussion before us.

We must begin by taking account of the several sciences. If we start with the more abstract sciences and proceed to the more concrete, we shall put mathematics first. Then in order will follow physics, chemistry, physiology both botanical and animal. As we thus proceed, each science takes for granted the results of the more abstract sciences which have preceded it. When, however, we leave physiology to go on to psychology, we find that it is only partly true that psychology demands a knowledge of its predecessors. A new element comes in. In the other sciences we study processes from the outside; in psychology we indeed study some processes from the outside, for example when we try to interpret the consciousness of animals. But the most characteristic part of psychology is that which is reached from the inside, by introspection, when consciousness expresses itself. It is at this point that we can enter fully upon anthropology, the scientific study of man, and not before. Not before this stage do we enter upon the subjects included under humanism. And when we do so enter, we find that we are no longer confined to the judgments of facts which make up the positive sciences, or, as Sir Ray Lankester calls them, the natural sciences. Sir Ray Lankester introduces an element of confusion when he removes the obvious and convenient distinction between those studies which are specially concerned with man such as folklore, comparative religion, history, literature, and so forth, and those studies such as physics and chemistry, which do not regard man as distinguished from the rest of the universe. So far as man is

something more than an animal, so far as the natural sciences with their judgments of fact need to be supplemented by humanist studies with their judgments of value, to that extent only (I must point out to Sir Ray Lankester) is man a spiritual being, as imperfect as you like, but still spiritual. When the editor was reprinting so large a part of the 'Essays on a Liberal Education,' why did he omit Wilson's paper 'On Teaching Natural Science in Schools?' The explanation is not far to seek. Wilson agrees (p. 256) that 'an education in science alone would not be the highest,' that 'in order to train men education must deal mainly with the feelings, the history, the language of men.' Such was the verdict of the one 'scientific' contributor to the volume in question.

We must therefore, in our systematic study of the problem, call in the assistance of human psychology and human ethics. It is the business of education, in the light of these sciences, to encourage the individual to form good habits of thinking, feeling, and acting. Perhaps the most effective, although not always the most satisfactory, means to this end is found in social opinion, social pressure, and social example. The boy who goes to school or the man who earns his living, needs, as far as he can, to understand and to value rightly these social forces, if only because he himself is a contributory element. And the individual cannot thus take his part effectively unless his imagination is exercised upon human affairs. Here, the natural sciences leave us at the threshold. They lack the watchword, the 'open sesame.' But the boy who in Latin has struggled as far as Caesar's Gallic War, or in Greek as far as the Anabasis of Xenophon, has had to construct in his own mind a picture, imperfect indeed, but yet a picture, of another age and another civilisation. Here we have a hint of the services of the classics in developing the boy's imagination: more than a hint is unnecessary. Now it is an ascertained fact that the development of the imagination accompanies to a very striking degree the development of the sense of language values. The Spirit comes often by way of the Word. Not all are susceptible

of this development to a very great extent, but there is reason for holding that to a small extent all human beings are thus susceptible. It has yet to be shown that English and modern languages, other than English, offer the like discipline to the imagination and the speech faculty, which is furnished, say, by the Greek New Testament. English teaching, under scientific influences, fails to apply judgments of value. I still smart under the injustice of being compelled for an English examination to learn by heart when a boy a second-rate poem like Parnell's 'Hermit.' And the case of English studies is no better in these latter days. The classical authors—'splendors of the firmament of time'—whom Sir Ray Lankester characteristically describes (p. 264) as 'more or less ignorant and deluded,' rarely condescend to the level of thought and expression which is found when students of natural science leave their proper province. And this leads me to my third point: the classical tradition puts a boy in the way not only of a cultivated imagination and an increased susceptibility to the exact use of language: he is familiarised, as he tries to enter into the varied styles of the classical writers, with the application of a standard of beauty. This exercise of taste is a common possession of all modern literatures, so far as they derive from the classics.

So far as the classical tradition has disappeared in craftsmanship, to that extent our English surroundings have become barren, stale, unprofitable. The Victorian age is in this respect a by-word. The application in England of science to industrial processes from about 1760 marked the beginning of the end. Since that time the world has not only become uglier day by day so far as human production is concerned, but the human mind has lost for lack of exercise the power of responding to the appeal of the beautiful. The craftsman and the artist live out their careers in an alien world. Mr. Wells (p. 187), in his capacity of a prophet of to-day, rightly interprets the mind of to-day when he says that 'beautiful writing or painting is educational by reason of its thought and illumination, and not by reason

of its beauty.' I had been waiting for 'thought and illumination.' I now understand why the 'educationalist' empties the House of Commons, committees, public meetings. He speaks for a world from which beauty is left out.

The exclusive pursuit of natural science narrows the imagination by concentrating it upon non-human facts. It leaves undeveloped, or cramps or distorts the power of expression. A colleague of mine unkindly complains that Huxley was the last scientific man who wrote English.

The industrial revolution, with science for its guide, has destroyed the beauty of human surroundings. And English scientific men are in the main unconscious of the external amenities of life, an unconsciousness which they share with their business contemporaries. But the workman has awakened to his loss in this respect, his ugly dwellings, and his mean streets. He has been exploited spiritually by his isolation from the ancient and lovely traditions of the exterior world. And if he 'rots inwardly and foul contagion spreads,' who shall say how far the guilt lies with those who have taken from his home the last touches of beauty?

Mr. Wells is better than his word. In a passage (p. 206) which doubtless escaped the notice of the editor, Mr. Wells proposes that the 'common arch of the whole system' of education should rest upon the two pillars of classical and scientific studies. And there I should be content to leave it. The widened sympathies of the classical student can find room and a welcome for the renaissance of science, especially when, as in Mr. Sanderson's pages, he catches echoes of the glorious Lionardo. In schools with an engineering side a boy, not infrequently, goes over from the classical fifth to the engineering side, and the classical boy in one year, often, so I am assured, catches up and passes the engineering boy who starts with a two years' advantage in his special subject. But there is no fundamental hostility between the classical and the scientific curriculum. They find room in turn and *in their due order* for the development of those varied in-

dividualities which, in proportion to their rich difference, contribute to the meaning of the world.

I wonder what the Master of Balliol thinks of the concluding essay of the editor? Unhappy turns of speech like 'the dismal fatuities of grammarians' (p. 259), or 'overgrown staff of "unable" teachers' (p. 267), are matched by the elaborate identification of knowledge with wisdom (p. 254) and the unscientific confusion between the natural and the human sciences. Sir Ray Lankester has indeed given away the whole case of science so far as he is concerned. Wisdom is not the inevitable companion either of classical or scientific knowledge. It stands above them both, for it determines the ends to which man must direct not only his knowledge but his actions. But the Master of Balliol must be careful of the company he keeps. The spiritual life of man would indeed be starved if its main food were confined to the excite-

ments of the unusually distant, say, Saturn and his rings, or the movement of the blood corpuscles as seen under a microscope (p. 3). I say nothing of the consolations of religion. But a quotation from another Oxford writer shall be set against Mr. A. L. Smith and the interesting reprints from 'The Essays on a Liberal Education':

The words of some classic author . . . passages which to a boy are but rhetorical common-places . . . at length come home to him, when long years have passed, and he has had experience of life, and pierce him, as if he had never before known them, with their sad earnestness and vivid exactness.

Not even Mr. Sanderson's delightful exhibition of two years ago (p. 225) could give me the comfort which Newman and less eloquent souls have found in the loved pages of Virgil and Horace.

FRANK GRANGER.

University College,
Nottingham.

DIE PYTHAIS: STUDIEN ZUR GESCHICHTE DER VERBINDUNGEN ZWISCHEN ATHEN UND DELPHI.

Die Pythais: Studien zur Geschichte der Verbindungen zwischen Athen und Delphi. Inaugural-dissertation von AXEL BOETHIUS. Uppsala, 1918.

THE author, a pupil of Professor Sam Wide, has made a very useful study of the Athenian sacrifice at Delphi, which was offered from time to time and called ἡ Πυθαία. His conclusions, which are based on a careful examination of the Delphic inscriptions, are as follows: at some early period, in response to a request from Athens, the oracle ordered that the sacrifice should be sent, when Zeus lightened above Harma (on Mount Parnes), and this led to the foundation of a sort of college of Pythaiatae, who watched for the lightning three days and three nights in three months of the year. But so seldom did they observe it that ὅταν δι' Ἀρματος ἀστράψῃ became proverbial by the time of Pericles for 'seldom' or 'late,' as a comedian adapted the phrase to Pericles ὅταν διὰ Πικνὸς ἀστράψῃ. The observatory was

'on the wall between the Pythion and the Olympion' (Strabo). In passing let us observe that this is one more refutation of the theory of Dörpfeld that the name Pythion was anciently applied to the north-west corner of the Acropolis. Mr. Boethius is also definitely against connecting Euripides, *Ion* 285, with the lightning on Harma and the watch of the Pythaiatae. When the sacrifice was actually performed, it took place with the ancient ceremony, alluded to by Aeschylus, *Eumenides* 12, in which axe-bearers led the way. Mr. Boethius thinks it most probable that the axes were originally votive, like the Tenedian axe. Either this was the case, or they were relics of the ancient ritual, as observed in the case of the Buphonia. Attic legend connected the ceremony either with the coming of the god from Delos to Delphi or with Theseus clearing the land of robbers (*Schol. Med.* 1 and 2). The route taken was *via* Oenoe and Cithaeron, not *via* the Tetrapolis and Tanagra, according to Mr. Boethius,

who however deals fully with the quasi-independent religious connexions of the Tetrapolis with Delphi and Delos, a subject treated by Philochoros. Special ceremonies of the Pythais were the Pyrphoria and Tripodophoria, in which Mr. Boethius rightly sees the acknowledgment of the original foundation of the Python at Athens from Delphi. After 330 B.C. there was a long interval during which the sacrifice was not offered. It was always quite distinct from the Panhellenic Pythia, and was an Athenian function performed at Delphi. In 138 B.C. the custom was revived, without the old watch for the lightning, and at first without the Pythaists. Between this year and 97 B.C. the processions can be reconstructed with the aid of Delphic inscriptions as having taken place four times. In 128 the well-known Paeon of Limenius, to which the musical notes are attached, was sung, relating the old story of the coming of the god from Delos by way of Athens. In these years deliberate

archaism led to the restoration of the Pythaistae both adults and boys (an Icarian relief of the fourth century, of which Mr. Boethius gives an illustration, shows four such boys accompanied by an adult), while every effort was made by the Athenian state to lend dignity to the occasion by official representation. Even the Athenian guild of actors co-operated, and they were not only thanked by the Delphians, but a statue was erected with a complimentary inscription for their performances. Into the details of these later celebrations of the Pythais it is unnecessary to enter, but the general impression left by Mr. Boethius' work is that he has carefully studied the evidence and arrived at the best conclusions. His chief service is definitely to distinguish the Pythais from the Pythia, the Panhellenic festival, to which e.g. Demosthenes (xix. 128) refers. Why is a dissertation by a Swede written in German? G. C. RICHARDS.

Oriel College, Oxford.

GREEK POLITICAL THEORY: PLATO AND HIS PREDECESSORS.

Greek Political Theory: Plato and his Predecessors. 8vo. One vol. Pp. xiii + 403. London: Methuen and Co., September, 1918.

MR. BARKER'S volume is a recasting—indeed almost a rewriting—of the first part of his book on *The Political Philosophy of Plato and Aristotle* published in 1906. The writing of it, as he says, has been 'pure pleasure,' and he will take it as a compliment that the reading of it, pleasurable in itself, should have sent the present writer back to the even greater pleasure of communing with the spirit of their common master. He will forgive him then if this notice should refrain from dealing in detail with the virtues and occasional deficiencies of what will undoubtedly become a standard book for students of Greek political thought, and should dwell on one particular aspect of Plato's work, to the full significance of which this latest study, like others, has not done full justice.

'A city, we must remember,' says Mr. Barker in his second chapter (p. 24), in a passage added since the earlier volume, 'always meant to the Greeks a community of persons rather than an area of territory. They spoke in terms of men where we . . . tend to speak in terms of acres' or rather of square miles. The contrast here drawn is not only true, but fundamental, and its implications are a good deal deeper than Mr. Barker and other modern students of Plato appear to have realised. For if Plato's city is not a territorial unit, like a modern state, but a spiritual unit, resembling rather a college or a church, much of his teaching will be inapplicable, or applicable only after careful allowance has been made, to modern political conceptions and conditions. Neglect of this obvious fact has led to much confusion of thought. Two examples from Mr. Barker's volume must suffice. The word *law*, he points out (p. 39), implied to the Greeks an inherited moral

sanction, while to us it means merely 'a set of regulations.' True, but on p. 268, forgetful of the distinction, he tells us that 'Plato's insistence on the rule of law within a system of politically independent states entitles him to rank as a forerunner of international law.' Of international morality, of *Sittlichkeit*, yes; but of the Permanent Court of Justice at the Hague, a tribunal suspended *in vacuo* above states and peoples of varying outlook and moral standards—emphatically 'no.' Plato never fell into the current modern error of thinking that a moral relation between diverse groups, whether tribes or large states, can be brought into existence by the fiat of a few carefully-collected sages.

Our other example is from a very different field. It concerns the much disputed question of Plato's attitude towards art. Plato disbelieved, Mr. Barker tells us (p. 371), in 'a general taste,' and so he fell back, in his search for a controlling authority, on 'State regulation.' 'With many of his regulations we of this generation instinctively disagree,' adds Mr. Barker; and no wonder, for the idea of a modern territorial state or municipality attempting to hedge round the intellectual and artistic initiative of the very mixed body of persons within its jurisdiction is plainly repugnant to us.

But if we remember that Plato is thinking in terms, not of a state, or even of a municipality, but of a society with an inherited social and artistic tradition of its own, of a 'school' in the full meaning of that word, the case is altered.

In the *Republic*, in fact, the modern man finds not one but two distinct problems treated—the problem of government and the problem of what

for want of a better term we must call 'nationality.' States have no art; or, when they have one, it bears all the marks of the patron's order or the parasite's flattery. But nations, groups of individuals with a common racial and social inheritance and common memories and aspirations, can and do produce art, and, with art, a common standard of taste and appreciation. What would be frank absurdity in Dublin Castle and even in the Dublin Municipality might be quite feasible for the Abbey Theatre or the Gaelic League or even for the National University of Ireland. Similarly the idea of an American art controlled from Washington merely excites ridicule, but readers of Miss Jane Addams' and other books on the life and activities of the different immigrant nationalities will realise how strong and life-giving a power resides in the artistic tradition which they have brought with them and which is sustained and nourished by deliberate communal action. A 'bazaar of styles' is quite as demoralising as the 'bazaar of constitutions' which Plato denounces in democracy, and the experience of modern national groups, reaching out to the expression of their corporate consciousness in art and literature and other forms of spiritual achievement, and reacting against the influence of a disintegrating cosmopolitanism, throws valuable new light on some of the perplexities which have troubled Mr. Barker and others on this subject.

To develop this point would carry one far beyond the limits of a review, and an apology is perhaps needed for having allowed Mr. Barker's excellent book to serve as an opportunity for suggesting it.

A. E. ZIMMERN.

DREAMS IN GREEK POETRY.

The Dream in Homer and Greek Tragedy. By WILLIAM STUART MESSER, Ph.D. New York: Columbia University Press. London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press, 1918. \$1.25 net and 5s. 6d. net.

THE Department of Classical Philology of Columbia University has approved this monograph as a contribution to knowledge worthy of publication. We are happy to agree, and we hope that Mr. Messer will be able to fulfil his promise of further contributions to his chosen subject. He was led to the study of the dreams in Greek literature by the discovery—which every serious student of Latin literature will make—that without Greek you cannot get far into Latin; for he first set out to investigate Roman dreams (see *Mnemosyne*, 45, 78-92). His present work is really introductory to a more general study of the ancient dream, especially as portrayed in Latin literature. It deals particularly with the dreams in Homer, Hesiod, and the Tragedians, (1) as a part of the machinery, a motive force in the development of action, narrative, plot, and (2) as artistic ends in themselves, more or less complete, more or less refined, more or less natural or artificial. The author has collected, for his own purposes, all dreams and references to dreams that he can find in Greek or Latin literature down to the second century A.D., and his footnotes give proof of his wide reading and of the intrinsic interest of his materials. His style is somewhat inelegant, and his arrangement unattractive. His method is to plough solemnly through the whole field, noting and discussing each dream as it appears. Accordingly there is too much repetition, and a bewildering abundance of cross-references. If only he had added a short chapter summarising his results, his work would have been more likely to be recognised for what it is—a very sound and useful piece of not particularly inspired research. That the author is no mere

compiler is shown by many touches of just literary appreciation. He is at his best in pointing out that Penelope's dream of geese and eagle (*Odyssey* XIX.) is unlike other dreams in Homer, an allegorical vision which demands interpretation, 'a new departure for the epic, and a model for the allegorical dreams of tragedy.' The second part, in which the eagle returns and announces himself as Odysseus, is in the manner of the older type, the objective dream which tells its own tale without any mystery; and this addition, Mr. Messer thinks, is an indication that the poet felt uneasy about the introduction of the new technique (pp. 33-4). Excellent, again, is the remark (p. 57) that 'the immediate source of the dream in tragedy is to be found *not in religion and cult*, but in the *literature*.' So is the discussion (p. 81 ff.) of the dream in Sophocles' *Electra*, where the old literary *motif* is adapted, not so much for its mechanical effect upon the plot as for its value as a means and an excuse for the portrayal of character. Finally, the description of the dream in Euripides' *Iphigenia in Tauris* as approximating to 'the highly-chiselled miniatures in which the Alexandrian period delights,' strikes me as just and illuminating. Where Mr. Messer sticks to the literature and his own commonsense, his work is sound and useful. Sometimes, unfortunately, he is led, like most of us, into the dangerous by-paths of cult-conjecture. On p. 4, for example, after a sound sane statement in the text that Hermes is *not* portrayed in Homer as a god of dreams, and that *ὄνειροπομπός* as his epithet is *not* ante-Alexandrian, we are dismayed to read in a footnote that 'From Hermes *ὄνειροπομπός* to Hermes *χθόνιος* . . . the step was short.' Similar mental pressure produced, I think, the strange juggling with the meaning of the plain word *κακόν* on p. 12. But why, in the footnote to p. 16, Mr. Messer suddenly exclaims, 'Add Granger . . .' etc., I cannot conjecture.

J. T. S.

A GOLD TREASURE OF THE LATE ROMAN PERIOD.

A Gold Treasure of the Late Roman Period. By WALTER DENNISON, Swarthmore College. (University of Michigan Studies, Humanistic Series, Vol. XII. Studies in East Christian and Roman Art, Part II.). One volume. 11" x 8". Pp. 87. Fifty-four plates and 57 text illustrations. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1918. \$2.50 net.

THIS study was completed by the author just before his death in March, 1917. An In Memoriam notice is appended to the volume.

The book is a description of thirty-six objects said to belong to a gold treasure found in Egypt. The word 'said' is used advisedly, for, though there is enough stylistic resemblance to connect together several of the pieces, the evidence relating to the discovery of the objects is extremely unsatisfactory. The pieces were brought at different times by Arabs to a 'well-known antiquary of Cairo.' They were purchased from him by four collectors, with the result that they are now scattered in Detroit, New York, the Antiquarium in Berlin, and the British Museum. Four of the objects—two necklaces and a pair of serpent bracelets—are stated to have been found at Alexandria. They are clearly of earlier date (second-third century after Christ) than the bulk of the objects which the author rightly assigns to the sixth century.

The volume consists mainly of a very detailed and accurate description of the objects which comprise striking but somewhat florid examples of the Oriental jeweller's art. Chief among them are two pectorals set with Imperial coins and medallions of the fifth and sixth centuries, to which were attached medallion pendants (in one case with designs depicting the Annunciation and the Miracle of Cana). There are other medallions in gold settings, necklaces with jewel pendants, a breast-chain with openwork medallions, bracelets with openwork decoration and jewels, and a rock-crystal statuette of a woman of no

high artistic merit. The coins in the pectorals range from Theodosius I. (379-395) to Mauricius Tiberius (582-602).

The ornaments were no doubt found in Egypt (Assiût in Upper Egypt and the site of the ancient Antinoë are each mentioned as provenance), but no reliance can be placed on the statements made as to the find-spot. There is indeed doubt as to whether all the objects (excluding those assigned to Alexandria) were found together. The conjecture that Alexandria was the original place of manufacture has some plausibility, but there is no reason to suppose that there would be any marked difference between the products of Egyptian and Syrian jewellers at the period to which these ornaments belong.

The objects, though primarily of interest to the student of 'Byzantine' jewellery, are also instructive for those who study ancient jewellery as a whole. There can be little doubt that the bulk of what is known as 'Roman' jewellery owes its form and decoration to Eastern jewellers, primarily those of Antioch and Alexandria and later those of Constantinople. The pure Greek tradition dies out, as far as can be seen, in the second and third centuries after Christ—that tradition which laid stress on the exquisite modelling of gold into human or animal form. Survivals of this Greek tradition are seen in the Rams' head necklace (Plate XXIX.) and the Serpent bracelets (Plate XLVII.) of the present publication, objects which are admittedly of different origin and of earlier date than the bulk of this treasure. The other and main portion of these ornaments illustrate the development in the 'Byzantine' period of features which can be traced back to the jewellery of the Hellenistic period. Alexander opened and Pompey reopened the Nearer East to the Graeco-Roman world. It was in the Hellenistic period that precious stones became a prominent element in jewellery, and from that period they grew in prominence till we arrive at overloaded ornaments such as the lunate bejewelled necklace

of openwork shown in Plate XXXV. The openwork, which is so conspicuous in the ornaments of this find, begins on a modest scale in the first and second centuries after Christ, and is then developed with increasing complication and arabesque effects. A find from Tunis of the third century (*B. M. Jewellery*, 2,824, 2,866-7) may be cited as marking an intermediate stage both in the use of precious stones and also of openwork.

The pectorals of the present find show the use of coins as elements in jewellery—an element foreign to Greek taste—carried to extremes. The coin as a feature of jewellery appears to have been introduced into 'Roman' ornaments under Oriental influence about the first century after Christ, when the belief in its prophylactic virtues not improbably assisted in popularising it. Incidentally it may be noted that the statement on p. 105 that coins of Caracalla are the earliest framed gold coins known is not quite accurate. The

British Museum possesses a gold necklace with a pendant in the form of an *aureus* of Domitian in a plain gold setting (*B. M. Jewellery*, 2,735: from Egypt).

The way in which this interesting find has been scattered abroad reflects no great credit upon the control of antiquities in Egypt. A satisfactory control is notoriously difficult. It may be suggested, however, that a partial remedy could be found in making all trade in antiquities in a country such as Egypt a State Monopoly. The success of such a remedy would of course depend on the readiness of the State to pay finders the fair market price of the antiquities discovered. It could recoup itself by selling such antiquities as it did not require or could not afford to retain.

The book is admirably illustrated by heliotype plates, half-tone blocks, and line drawings.

F. H. M.

XENOPHON, *HELLENICA* I. V.

Xenophon, *Hellenica*, I. V. Translated by CARLETON L. BROWNSON. Loeb Series.

THE *Hellenica* in the original makes for tedium, and no translation could, as a whole, be more than tolerable. A literal translation is frankly intolerable; and unfortunately it is a literal translation that Mr. Brownson is providing. Opening the volume at random, we light on the following passage near the beginning of the Third Book:

'And when she had become mistress of the province, she not only paid over the tributes no less faithfully than had her husband, but besides this, whenever she went to the Court of Pharnabazus she always carried him gifts, and whenever he came down to her province she received him with far more magnificence and courtesy than any of his other governors, and she not only kept securely for Pharnabazus the cities which he had received from her husband, but also gained possession of cities on

the coast which had not been subject to him—Larisa, Hamaxitus, and Colonae—attacking their walls with a Greek mercenary force, while she herself looked on from a carriage; and when a man won her approval she would bestow bounteous gifts upon him, so that she equipped her mercenary force in the most splendid manner.'

Mr. Brownson might well ponder Chapman's rule: 'It is the part of every knowing and judicial interpreter not to follow the number and order of the words, but the material things themselves, and sentences to weigh diligently; and to clothe them with words, and such a style and form of oration as are most apt to the language into which they are concerted.' An English reader, knowing Xenophon only through Mr. Brownson's version, will surely wonder how Arrian or anyone else (cf. Lucian, *Quomodo hist. sit scribenda init.*) can have thought his prose worthy of imitation. The student who wants an accurate 'crib' to the

Hellenica will find it here; but those who look for something more must still go to Dakyns.

I think that Mr. Brownson would do better to follow Keller's text more faithfully.

In disputed passages he sometimes returns to the readings of the MSS., and offers conventional renderings which the Greek words as printed cannot bear.

E. C. MARCHANT.

TWO TRAGEDIES OF SENECA.

L. Annaei Senecae *Thyestes*, *Phaedra*. Recensuit, Praefatus Est, Appendicem Criticam Addidit Humbertus Moricca. Pp. i-xxvi, 1-122. Ex Officina Regia I. B. Paraviae et Soc.: Augustae Taur. 1917. Lire 2.50.

THE aim of the Paravia series, some volumes of which have already been noticed in the *Classical Review*, is to present Italy with a worthy collection of Latin texts revised by competent authorities, under the general editorship of Professor Pascal of the University of Pavia. An incidental aim is to free Italy from the need of having recourse to the foreigner (*ricorrere agli stranieri*), so that one perforce recalls the famous political motto in Italian history of the nineteenth century, '*Italia fara da se*.' It may be said at once that these handy volumes from Turin, each containing a scholarly introduction on the MSS., and a reasonably adequate, though not exhaustive, apparatus, are themselves destined to receive a welcome abroad.

The *Praefatio* to the *Thyestes* and *Phaedra*, besides citing the *testimonia veterum* on the tragedies, and on Seneca as a dramatic writer, describes the classes of MSS. of the tragedies (of which a family-tree is given on p. xix), and summarises the textual principles of previous editors, as well as those of the present editor himself. His own attitude is more catholic and, in general, sounder and freer than Leo's. Signor Moricca agrees that the *Etruscus* (E) is the best authority, but when E is at fault he holds that the kindred MSS. M and N are to be consulted. Thinking more highly of the inferior A class than Leo does, Moricca has very sensibly recorded certain readings from A MSS. which both Leo and Richter have either omitted without good reason

or cited incorrectly. While, however, he thus does fuller justice to the A tradition, it is unfortunate that he has not broken with E far enough to accept such readings as *sericus somnus* for *certior somnus* in *Phaedra* 520, and *rosae* for *comae*, *ib.* 769. I agree with the late Mr. C. E. Stuart's preference for these in *C.Q.*, 1911, pp. 33-35. Similarly, in the reference to the river Tagus, *Thyest.* 355, I believe with him (*C.Q.* 1912, p. 20) that the MSS. *c* and *p* of the A class certainly remove an error from the usual text of the passage (which is missing in E), inasmuch as they agree with τ (=readings supported by Treveth's commentary) in giving *caro . . . alveo*, not *claro . . . alveo*.

Signor Moricca in his text again and again displays a fidelity to the MSS. which declines to follow the sometimes amusingly arbitrary deletions and transpositions of lines indulged in by Leo. Refusing, for instance, to pull about the text of *Phaedra* 465-480 as Teutonic editors have done, he says wisely: '*Ego autem versus ordine tradito nulli rationi obstare persuasum mihi habui*.' He has the good sense also to eschew Leo's postponement of *et . . . furoris* from *Phaed.* 343 till after 348, which is due to Leo's ignorance of the fact that stags bellow in the rutting season, and his consequent objection to *mugitu* in 343. Nor is the editor caught by every blast of vain emendation: he records but does not accept unnecessary changes like Leo's *ex quibus utrimque* for *ex cuius ortu*, *Ph.* 890, and his *sedesque mutas* for *sedesque mutat*, *ib.* 508 — conjectures which suggest that, though Seneca may not have been a great poet, he was not guilty of all that foreign scholars have ascribed to him. How could *mutas* suit spots resonant with the songs of birds and rustlings of branches?

Printer's errors are few. I have

noticed *expressit*, p. xxii, l. 31; *puchrior*, p. 76 (*Ph.* 743); and *tumit* for *tumuit* in the Appendix Critica, p. 113, on *Ph.* 1,007. In *Ph.* 146, which reads *tantum esse facinus credis et vacuum metu*, the word *tantum* cannot be seriously pro-

posed, but must be a misprint for *tutum*, the accepted reading, which is not mentioned.

J. WIGHT DUFF.

Armstrong College,
Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

CICERO'S LETTERS TO ATTICUS.

Cicero's Letters to Atticus. With an English Translation by E. O. WINSTEDT. Vol. III. Loeb Classical Library, Heinemann, 1918. 7s. 6d. net.

WITH this volume—the first dates from 1912—Mr. Winstedt completes the Loeb edition of the *Epistulae ad Atticum*. In arrangement, of course, the book conforms to the familiar scheme. The introduction deals with Cicero's latter days, his manuscripts, and the obligations of his translator, in as much detail as could be reasonably expected within the compass of five and a quarter foolscap octavo pages. The text, 'based as usual on Teubner,' is faced by the version and accompanied by a modest contingent of footnotes, rather a liberal proportion of which turn on the reduction of sesterces to guineas. Then comes a chronological table of the letters, also based on Teubner, together with an *index nominum*, of the sort, unfortunately, in which 'Iunius Brutus (M.), murderer of Caesar,' is followed by fifteen lines of Arabic numerals and by nothing more helpful.

To the professional scholar Mr. Winstedt does not offer much in this edition. Where there is obscurity he is diffident of all but reflected light, and his book contains neither a new conjecture nor a new interpretation; he has been content to give the amateur a sensible and conventional text explained by a sensible and conventional rendering. Some, indeed, of the conventions which are loyally observed might with advantage have gone by the board, though Mr. Winstedt is only one of a highly distinguished company of sinners. He still indulges in those anachronistic jocularities which, as a rule, neither give the meaning of Cicero's Latin—

or Greek—nor recapture its tone. 'Ἀδόλεσχος' (XVI. 11) has to him the connotation of 'gas-bag.' Cicero elsewhere declines to 'kowtow.' At XII. 4, the playful *de Catone πρόβλημα* 'Ἀρχιμήδειον *est*' gives place to 'about Cato, that would puzzle a Philadelphian lawyer'; although at XIII. 28, where Cicero harks back to the phrase and the Philadelphian is not so easily introduced, we descend to the plain and inexact prose of 'an insoluble problem,' which at all events avoids sullyng the page with the name of Archimedes. Apart, however, from the question of anachronism, Mr. Winstedt has, perhaps, a tendency to forget that some epistolographers are men of letters, that Cicero might be informal but could not be amorphous, and that, whatever the precise shades of his familiar style, he would scarcely write to Atticus in the schoolboy *argot* favoured by his translators as a refuge from the Chesterfield manner. This juvenility of diction—it is hard to call it anything else—is not so marked in Mr. Winstedt's last volume as in the other two, but it is still over-much to the fore. It is traceable in unlicked sentences such as 'I will write fuller and more about politics later, and do you write what you are doing and what is being done' (*plura et πολιτικώτερα postea, et tu quid agas et quid agatur*); in useless negligences such as 'let me know as soon as you know' (scribes *ad me cum scies*); and in idioms such as 'mess about' (*muginari*), 'go silly' (*τετυφώσθαι*), 'act the giddy goat' (*κεκέφωμαι*), 'is all bunkum' (*totum est σχεδίασμα*), 'that's jolly good news about Buthrotum' (*bene mehercule de Buthroto*). Quest'è quel Marco Tullio?

In general, Mr. Winstedt is unduly cold to the airs and graces of Marcus Tullius, who has a habit of being airy

and graceful even to Atticus. In particular, he ignores quite obvious verbal repetitions or variations. At XII. 14, Cicero no doubt reflected a moment or two as he wrote: *Sed vere laudari ille vir non potest, nisi haec ornata sint, quod ille ea, quae nunc sunt, et futura viderit, et, ne fierent, contenderit, et facta ne videret, vitam reliquerit. Horum quid est quod Aledio probare possimus?* It was worth the while to save a little more from the wreck than survives in the paraphrase: 'But he is a man who cannot properly be eulogised, unless these points are fully treated, that he foresaw the present state of affairs, and tried to prevent it, and that he took his own life by preference to seeing it come about. Can I win Aledius' approval of any of that?' A couple of instances, perfectly trivial but typical in more ways than one of Mr. Winstedt's easy-going style, may be added. *Est bellum aliquem libenter odisse et, quem ad modum non omnibus dormire, ita non omnibus servire: etsi mehercule, ut tu intelligis, magis mihi isti serviunt, si observare servire est* (XII. 49 *fin.*) becomes: 'It is quite a good thing to have somebody to hate with a will, and not to pander to everybody any more than to be asleep for everybody: though upon my word, as you know, Caesar's party are obsequious to me more than I to them, if attention is obsequiousness.' The balance is redressed at XIII. 10, where Cicero writes: *Minime miror te et graviter ferre de Marcello et plura vereri periculi genera. Quis enim hoc timeret quod neque acciderat antea nec videbatur natura ferre ut accidere posset? Omnia igitur metuenda.* His translator dis-

dares the foible: 'I am not at all surprised at your being upset about Marcellus and fearing all sorts of new dangers. For who would have feared this? Such a thing never happened before and it did not seem as though nature could allow such things to happen. So one may fear anything.'

This indifference to the form extends at times to the content, though seldom with more serious results than to make the reader wonder why Mr. Winstedt is not satisfied to say simply what the Latin says—why, for instance, he should turn *ubi Brutum nostrum et quo die videre possim* into 'where Brutus is and when I can see him'; or *sed nulla iustior quam quod tu idem aliis litteris* into 'but none of them is better than one you mention in your letter'; or, a worse example, *tu de Antiocho scire poteris videlicet etiam quo anno quaestor aut tribunus mil. fuerit; si neutrum, saltem in praefectis an in contubernaliis fuerit, modo fuerit in eo bello* into 'You will be able to find out from Antiochus of course in what year he was quaestor or military tribune: if he was neither, then he would at least have been among the prefects or on the staff, provided he was in the war at all.' Unconsidered trifles of this sort, and there are too many of them, are a little apt to divert attention from the merits of the translation as a whole. Those merits are solid and unquestionable, and Mr. Winstedt deserves thanks for an edition which is a convenience to any reader and something like a necessity to those making their first acquaintance with the letters.

J. JACKSON.

SHORT NOTICES

The Old Testament MSS. in the Freer Collection. Part II.: *The Washington MS. of the Psalms.* Edited by HENRY A. SANDERS. 4to. Pp. 107+249, with 6 facsimile plates. New York: The Macmillan Company. Paper covers, \$2.00 net.

THE story of the discovery and subsequent purchase from an Arab dealer

near Cairo by Mr. Freer, in 1906, of this fifth-century MS., together with other Biblical portions, has been already told. The two parts forming the Psalms are now respectively designated Λ and Λ^a . They were found, as evidenced by the excellent facsimiles illustrating the volume, in a sadly decayed state, and have been skilfully restored by a process described at length.

Among other points of interest it may be noted that while the ink used throughout is dark brown, the oft-recurring Septuagint word *διαψαλμα*, which appears on the right hand margin, is, together with its abbreviations (also titles and numbers), in red, as becomes a rubrical direction. It occurs with some irregularity, possibly owing in large part to damaged leaves. It alternates with a kind of symbol which may perchance point to some lost system of the Hebrew '*Selah*,' which might be worth following up. That *διαψαλμα* (a word of uncertain meaning) should have been accepted as the equivalent of the even more dubious term '*Selah*' has never been explained. It seems likely that the LXX translators viewed the term '*Selah*' as conveying the idea of meditative pause, and that the Christian Church so used it. The MS. has characteristics peculiarly its own. There is a singular plan in the division and arrangement of syllables and words, and some of the large square uncials in use are set off by dots and strokes of varying shape. There are numerous liturgical abbreviations. Mr. Sanders offers no explanation of the series of dots and strokes, but the fact that the dots are generally found at the ends of lines, lend colour to the idea that suggests itself to our mind of some particular form of cadence. Many peculiarities occurring in Egyptian papyri are present in this MS. There is wellnigh a total absence of punctuation and accentuation. This irregularity in respect of later Greek MSS. from Egypt is worth attention. In a series of liturgical texts from Upper Egypt (now in the Metropolitan Museum of New York), Scripture quotations alone have accents, and these defy all ordinary laws. This feature may perhaps be explained on the theory that the Holy Scriptures were to be read (or intoned) after a customary manner. This fine reprint of the Greek text has the *lacunae* supplied from the Swete text with which the MS. is collated, accents and breathings being omitted, as in the original. As a Psalter text A is now the oldest representative, and this edition is in every way worthy of such distinction.

The New Testament MSS. in the Freer Collection. Part II.: The Washington MS. of the Epistles of St. Paul. Edited by HENRY A. SANDERS. 4to. Pp. 251+315, with 3 facsimile plates. New York: The Macmillan Company. Paper covers, \$1.25 net.

THE MS. fragment here described is of sixth-century date, written in Egypt by an expert scribe, and has much in common with other MSS. of this series. That a parchment MS., in such a woeful state of decay as that described, could have been brought to so serviceable a use seems wellnigh incredible. The text falls in well with the Alexandrian group of N.T. MSS., with important variations that lend weight to it. The Westcott and Hort text is generally used to supply missing portions, and variations are given by way of collation. The Epistle to the Romans and last part of 1 Corinthians are wanting.

Translations of Christian Literature. Series I. Greek Texts: St. Dionysius of Alexandria. Letters and Treatises by C. L. FELTOE, D.D. Pp. 110. S.P.C.K. 3s. 6d. net.

SOME years since Dr. Feltoe edited the letters and other remains of Dionysius in a volume of the Cambridge Patristic Texts, an esteemed work. The Introduction and much other illustrative matter is reproduced in a greatly condensed form in the present volume. In the writings of Dionysius, which are largely concerned with the controversies of the age, there is ample evidence of the purity of his style and literary attainments. The three treatises, if they can be so called, are fragmentary.

THE VALUE OF THE CLASSICS.

Value of the Classics. Edited by A. F. WEST. Demy 8vo. Pp. viii+396. Princeton University Press, 1917.

A CONFERENCE on classical studies was held at Princeton University in June, 1917. The volume before us contains the addresses which were delivered there, followed by statements affirming the value of classical training. These

statements were made by the leading representatives of every side of American life. President Wilson, ex-President Roosevelt, and Mr. Lansing are in the vanguard of an army of experts to whom the general world will perhaps pay more attention because the striking statistics at the end of the book show that in American secondary schools the number of pupils who take Latin is continually advancing. Greek, however, occupies an insignificant place.

The impression left by reading this valuable summary of opinion is not only that, in practice, Latin and Greek develop the powers of expression and thereby of clear thinking, but that the attempt to revive before the mind the outlines of antique culture generally, strengthens in a unique manner that constructive imagination of which we are in such pressing need. The classics along with pure mathematics offer, to two different types of intelligence, alternative and indispensable disciplines. It is probable that the leadership in the intellectual world will remain with those peoples who refresh themselves at these ultimate springs. Unfortunately in England whereas physical science, as well as mathematics, is compulsory in our new secondary schools, Latin is falling more and more into the background and Greek is disappearing.

It is worth considering whether—to repeat a suggestion of Matthew Arnold—the Latin Vulgate might not be used

as an introduction to Latin studies. The Vulgate reaches back to the living language of the early Empire and forward to the languages of modern Europe. It is nearer also than Ciceronian Latin to the international language of the middle ages.

FRANK GRANGER.

The Letter of Aristeas, with an Appendix of Ancient Evidence on the Origin of the LXX. By H. ST. J. THACKERAY. Pp. 116. S.P.C.K. 2s. 6d. net.

THE most ancient account of the Septuagint is that derived from this letter by Aristeas, who asserts that he was an officer in the service of Ptolemy Philadelphus (285-247 B.C.). The story of the LXX. translation is open to the gravest suspicion, and the letter abounds with improbabilities and is now generally regarded as more or less fabulous. Its date may be assumed to be 170-130 B.C. It was used by Josephus and probably known to Philo. The leading facts of the history of this version have, however, been widely received by early authorities of note. Dr. Hody (*Aristea Hist.* Oxon. 1705) fully exposed the inconsistencies and anachronisms of the author. It clearly belongs to the class of Graeco-Jewish writings promoted to give effect to religious susceptibilities. These several publications, which are under the joint editorship of Dr. Oesterley and Canon Box, are highly commendable.

NOTES AND NEWS

GREEK MUSIC.

AN ordinary meeting of the Northumberland and Durham Classical Association was held in St. John's College, Durham, on Saturday, May 24, when a paper was read by Mr. J. F. Mountford, M.A., Lecturer in Classics, Armstrong College, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, on the subject of 'Greek Music: Methods of Study and Results.' A few illustrations on the piano were greatly appreciated. After questions and discussion, in which Professor Cruickshank, the Rev. C. G. Hall, Mr. Gilbert

Richardson, and Miss C. M. Shipley took part, Professor J. Wight Duff proposed, and the Rev. Dr. Dawson Walker seconded, a motion of hearty congratulation to Mr. Mountford on the recent award to him, for his researches on Greek music, of the Cromer Greek Prize administered by the British Academy.

The Society for the Reform of Latin Teaching, which has been in abeyance during the war, will hold its fourth summer school at Oxford, September 1-10. The secretary is Mr. N. Parry, 4, Church Street, Durham. Two

of its most active members, Captain J. L. Mainwaring and Captain Paine, have died for their country.

THE May number of the *Geographical Journal* contains a remarkable paper by Lieutenant-Colonel G. A. Beazley on Air Photography in Archaeology. The air-picture of the district round Samarra

disclosed the plan of an ancient city, with wide streets, public gardens, and all sorts of details. The detail was not recognisable on the ground. By the same means was disclosed the plan of the ancient irrigation system of the country, with detached forts to protect it. The paper and its accompanying plates deserve attention.

BOOKS RECEIVED

All publications which have a bearing on Classical Studies will be entered in this list if they are sent for review. The price should in all cases be stated.

. *Excerpts or Extracts from Periodicals and Collections will not be included unless they are also published separately.*

- Carra de Vaux* (B.) *Notes d'Histoire des Sciences.* 9" x 5½". Pp. 16. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale. Sur l'Origine des Chiffres (Extrait de 'Scientia,' pp. 273-282). 9½" x 6½". *Tableau des Racines Sémitiques* (arabehébreu). 11" x 8½". Pp. 36. Paris: Rue La Trémoille, 1919.
- Classical Studies in Honour of Charles Foster Smith.* By his Colleagues. 9½" x 6". Pp. 192. University of Wisconsin: Studies in Language and Literature, No. 3. Madison, 1919. \$1.
- Danby* (H.) *Tractate Sanhedrin, Mishnah and Tosefta* (Translations of Early Documents). 7½" x 4¾". Pp. 148. London: S.P.C.K., 1919. Cloth, 6s. net.
- Farnell* (L. R.) *The Value and the Methods of Mythologic Study.* 9¾" x 6¼". Pp. 16. Oxford University Press, 1919. 1s. 6d. net.
- Foucart* (M. P.) *Le Culte des Héros chez les Grecs.* 11" x 9". Pp. iv + 166. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1918. Fr. 6.20.
- Harris* (R.) *The Origin of the Doctrine of the Trinity.* 9½" x 6¼". Pp. 42. Origin and Meaning of Apple Cults. 10" x 6¼". Pp. 50. Manchester: University Press, 1919. Paper boards, 2s. 6d. net.
- Hearnshaw* (J. C.) *Select Extracts from Chronicles and Records relating to English Towns in the Middle Ages* (Texts for Students, No. 8). London: S.P.C.K., 1919. 9d. net.
- Hellenism in Turkey.* Published by the London Committee of Unredeemed Greeks. 9½" x 6¼". Pp. 22. London: Hesperia Press, 1919.
- Herford* (M. A. B.) *A Handbook of Greek Vase Painting.* 10¼" x 6½". Pp. xxii + 125. Manchester: University Press, 1919. Cloth, 9s. 6d. net.
- Hoppin* (J. C.) *A Handbook of Attic Red-Figured Vases. Vol. I.* 9½" x 6". Pp. xxiv + 472. Oxford University Press (for Harvard University Press), 1918. Cloth, 35s. net.
- Horn* (Fredrik). *Zur Geschichte der absoluten Partizipialkonstruktionen im Lateinischen.* 9½" x 6¼". Pp. viii + 106. Lund: Greerupsche Universitätsbuchhandlung.
- Jastrow* (M., jun.) *A Gentle Cynic: Being the Book of Ecclesiastes.* 8¾" x 6¼". Pp. 254. London: J. B. Lippincott, 1919. Cloth, 9s. net.
- Kutrzeba* (S.) *The Rights of Russia to Lithuania and White Ruthenia.* 9" x 6". Pp. 12. Paris: M. Flinikowski, 1919.
- Laurand* (L.) *Manuel des Etudes grecques et latines. Fasc. II.: Littérature grecque.* 2^e edition. 9" x 5¾". Pp. 99 + 260 + xvi. Paris: A. Picard, 1919. Fr. 3.50.
- Lutoslawski* (W.) and *Romer* (E.) *The Ruthenian Question in Galicia.* 9½" x 6¼". Pp. 32. Paris: Imprimerie Levé, 1919.
- Lutoslawski* (W.) *Bolshevism and Poland.* 9½" x 6¼". Pp. 38. Paris: M. Flinikowski, 1919.
- McClure* (M. L.) and *Feltow* (C. L.) *The Pilgrimage of Etheria* (Translations of Christian Literature, Series III.). 7¼" x 4¾". Pp. xlviii + 103. London: S.P.C.K., 1919. Cloth, 6s. net.
- Robin* (L.) *Etudes sur la Signification et sur la Place de la Physique dans la Philosophie du Platon.* 9½" x 6¼". Pp. 96. Paris: F. Alcan, 1919. Fr. 4.40.
- Slipper* (E.) *Eene Eigenaardigheid van Tacitus Zinsbouw.* 8½" x 6". Pp. 60. Kemink und Zoon, over den dom te Utrecht, 1918.
- Stampini* (E.) *Rivista di Filologia e di Istruzione Classica, Anno XLVII. Fascicolo 20.* 9½" x 6¼". Pp. 161 + 320. Torino: G. Chiantore, 1919. L. 5.
- Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association.* 1914, 9½" x 6½", vol. xlv., pp. 254 + cii; 1915, xlv., pp. 248 + lxxxii; 1916, xlvi., pp. 234 + xciv; 1917, xlviii., pp. 152 + liv. Boston: Ginn and Co. \$2 each.

city,
and
not
the
n of
the
otect
ying

at for

lished

luten
chen.
osche

eing
Pp.
loth,

ithu-
. 12.

es et
rque.
xvi.

uthe-
p. 32.

and.
vski,

Pil
stian
Pp.
loth,

sur
phie
aris :

van
nink
8.

stru-
20.
ian-

ican
6½",
48 +
917,
Co.